

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

JANUARY, 1906

NO. 7

Revolutions, Past and Present.

WHILE many within our own ranks may well be in doubt concerning the events of the present year, one thing is plain to-day even to the most stupid: Russia is now in the midst of a revolution, that for violence and significance may well be compared with the two greatest revolutions that history has as yet known—the English Revolution of the 17th century and the French of the 18th.

It is easy to draw comparisons between them, and their superficial resemblances are striking. Each of these revolutions was directed at absolutism, against which the mass of the nation arose, because its yoke had become unbearable—because it had brought misery, outrages and despair upon the country.

The resemblance does not go much further. We are met with fundamental differences the moment we penetrate beneath the political surface and investigate the class antagonisms which furnish the effective motive force of the movement.

There we find, first of all, as the great difference between earlier revolutions and the present one, that in the latter, for the first time in the history of the world, the industrial proletariat rises triumphantly as the dominant independent directing force. The rising of the Paris Commune of 1870 was but the revolt of a single city, suppressed within a few weeks. Now we see a revolution extending from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea, and from the Baltic to the Pacific, which has already continued for a year, and in which the proletariat grows ever mightier in power and self-consciousness.

To be sure we do not yet have the complete domination, the dictatorship of the proletariat,—not yet the socialist revolution, but only its beginnings. The proletariat of Russia is breaking its chains, only in order to free its hands for the class struggle against capitalism; it does not yet feel itself strong enough to attempt the expropriation of capital. But that the watchword of a proletarian class-struggle has been raised is a tremendous advance from the socialist standpoint, as contrasted with the revolutions of 1648 and 1789.

In each of these revolutions only the capitalist class was a victorious class. But, politically as well as economically, this class lives from the exploitation of the strength of others. It has never *made* a revolution, but always *exploited* them. It has always left the making of revolution, the fighting and its perils to the mass of the people. The real active force in the masses during the 17th and 18th centuries was not the proletariat, but the class of small traders and manufacturers; the proletariat was but their unconscious followers. It was the bold and self-conscious small capitalists of the metropolitan cities of London and Paris who dared to take up the leadership in the battle against absolutism, and who were successful in overthrowing it.

In Russia this class has been neither bold nor self-conscious, at least not during the last century, since there has been a Russian Czarism. It has been largely recruited only from uprooted peasants, who but a few decades ago were still serfs. And there is no great city dominating the whole Russian kingdom. Moreover, to-day, even in France and England the capital cities have lost their absolute domination, but must now share their power with the industrial cities; even in western Europe the small capitalists have ceased to be revolutionary, but have become rather a pillar of reaction and governmental power.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the small capitalists of Russia, together with the slum proletariat, have from the beginning joined the elements of the counter-revolution, placing themselves at the disposal of the police for the suppression of the revolution. But since this class of small capitalists has no political program and no political goal, it can be driven into the battle against the revolution only by the promise of private gain or the goal of personal revenge. But there is no booty to be gained by fighting a propertyless proletariat, and if this be armed only wounds and death. Consequently the reactionary little capitalist, as soon as he no longer has any political ideal becomes as cowardly as he is brutal; he vents his rage only on the weakest members of society. As an exploiter, he prefers women and children; in the present battle against the revolution he attacks only Jews and isolated students and not the sturdy laborers. So

the Russian counter-revolution soon becomes a riot of plunder, murder and arson. The revolutionary proletariat, in its battle against the reaction, is therefore as much the indisputable element in social progress, as it has long been the most significant element economically. On the other hand, the small capitalist class, so far as it does not unite with the proletariat, shows itself as a political factor to be capable of producing only evil and social destruction, just as economically it has to-day become little more than a parasite on the social body, maintaining its existence only at the expense of society.

In previous revolutions the peasantry have ranked next to the small trading class as the most important fighting group. To be sure the Peasant Revolt showed that even in the period of the Reformation, the latter class was capable only of destroying the state, but was no longer able to found a new independent political rulership. The peasantry no longer forms its own party, a definite political army, but serves only as auxiliary troops of some other army or party. Nevertheless it is by no means insignificant, since according as it throws its strength to one side or the other, it may determine defeat or victory. It sealed the downfall of the revolution in France in 1848, as well as the triumph of 1789 and the years that followed.

The role played by the peasantry in the great French Revolution, however, was wholly different from its part in the English one. In France the landed possessions of the nobility and clergy had maintained the full feudal form; they lived from the exploitation of the feudal peasantry, whom they pressed down with an inconceivable mass of misery, and in return for which, since they had become attaches of the court, they rendered no reciprocal service. The destruction of these landed possessions was one of the imperative tasks of the Revolution, and was the bond that secured the firm allegiance of the peasants.

In England the old feudal nobility had been destroyed during the War of the Roses, and had been replaced by a new fresh-baked nobility, who were in close sympathy with capitalism. The Reformation had plundered the churches for the benefit of this nobility. The old feudal economy had completely disappeared by the 17th century. What peasants remained were free masters of their own ground. The great landed possessions were not operated by the compulsory service of feudal peasants, but through capitalist tenants with wage-workers. Very few of the landed nobility had become attached to the court. The majority remained throughout the year upon their property, where they served as justices or in the local governments.

As a consequence the English revolution showed no tendency toward a general overthrow of landed property. To be

sure there were plenty of instances of the confiscation of property, but always as *political* and not as *social* measures. However covetous the peasants and tenants might have been of the great estates, no necessity compelled their dismemberment, while fear of the numerous country wage-workers effectively frightened them from beginning a process that might easily prove dangerous to themselves. The great English landed aristocracy did not simply survive the revolution, it ended it by a compromise with the bourgeoisie, who had also grown tired of the domination of the small traders and manufacturers, and thereby so fortified its rulership, that to-day there is no landed aristocracy, not even that of the German provinces east of the Elbe or Hungary, which sits as firmly in the saddle as they.

Things will develop very differently in Russia, the condition of whose peasantry is practically identical in all its details with that of French peasants before the revolution. Here the result of the two revolutions will be the same to the extent that we may expect the disappearance of the present great-landed estates throughout the whole Russian kingdom and their transformation into peasant possessions. Next to the Czarism it is the landed estates with whom the revolution must balance accounts.

It is impossible to foresee what form of agricultural production will develop upon the new foundations, but one thing is certain: at this point also the Russian and the French revolutions will be alike in that the breaking up of the great private landed estates will constitute a tie that will bind the peasants indissolubly to the revolution. We do not yet know what battle of races the new revolution may conceal within its bosom, and it is easily possible that differences may arise between the peasants and the city proletariat, but the former will fight with tooth and nail to defend themselves against any revolution that seeks to re-establish the old landed regime even by foreign intervention.

This brings us to the third factor to be considered in any comparison of the three revolutions—the foreign conditions which they create.

During the 17th century international commerce was still so small that the English revolution remained a purely local event that found no echo in the remainder of Europe. It was not foreign wars, but the long drawn out civil war arising from the great power of resistance of the landed nobility, that created the revolutionary military domination, and finally led to the dictatorship of a victorious general, Cromwell.

The end of the 18th century found a well-developed commerce between European nations, and the French revolution

convulsed all Europe; but its liberating efforts found only a weak echo. The convulsion was a result of the war which the united monarchs of Europe led against the one republic and from which there rose in France military domination and the empire of a victorious general, Napoleon.

Now, at the beginning of the 20th century, international relations have become so close that the beginning of the revolution in Russia was enough to awaken the enthusiastic echo in the proletariat of the whole world, to quicken the *tempo* of the class struggle, and to shake the neighboring empire of Austria to its foundations.

As a consequence any *coalition* of European powers against the revolution, such as took place in 1793, is inconceivable. Austria is at the present moment absolutely incapable of any strong external action. In France the proletariat is already strong enough in opposition to the government to prevent any interference for Czarism, even if the ruling powers were insane enough to think of such a thing. There is no fear of a coalition against the revolution and then only one *single power* which is expected to intervene in Russia: the *German Empire*.

But even the government of the German Empire may well consider before it enters upon a war that will not be a national war, but a dynastical war and as unpopular, as hated, as that which Russia led against Japan, and which may easily draw upon the German government similar internal consequences to those which that war has brought to Russia.

Whatever may happen there is no occasion to expect an era of long world wars such as the French revolution ushered in, and accordingly we need not fear that the Russian revolution will, like the former, end in a military dictatorship, or any sort of "Holy Alliance." Its promise is rather the ushering in of an era of European revolutions that will end with the *dictatorship of the socialist society*.

KARL KAUTSKY.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

The Unemployed Agitation in England.

FROM its formation in 1881 the Social-Democratic Federation has made special efforts in the direction of agitating the question of the unemployed. It has recognized that the unemployed are a necessary and inevitable creation of capitalism, and that the solution of the question of unemployment means the downfall of the capitalist system, just as the overthrow of capitalism means the solution of the unemployed problem. In the early years of the 'eighties there was exceptional distress and in 1883 the S. D. F. formulated a set of proposals, which were then called "Practical Proposals for Pressing Needs," which included an "Eight-Hour Day," "Free Meals for School Children," "Public Construction of Workmen's Dwellings," "The State Organization of the Unemployed," etc. In the winter of 1884-1885 a vigorous agitation was carried on in most of the large industrial centers, especially in London, and in February of the latter year, a mass meeting was held on the Thames Embankment, in a drenching downpour of rain, at which speeches were delivered by H. M. Hyndman, John Burns, James Macdonald, J. E. Williams, and others. A procession was afterwards marched to the Local Government Board, and an interview took place between the heads of that department and a deputation from the demonstration. As a result of that a circular was issued by the Local Government Board advising the various local administrative bodies to do all in their power in relieving distress and in providing useful work for the unemployed.

In February of the following year, 1886, the agitation having died down in the summer and been taken up again as winter came on, the Tory "Fair Traders" or Tariff Reformers, who endeavored to put the responsibility for distress and unemployment upon free imports, sought to take the wind out of our sails and to exploit the agitation in the interest of their nostrum. They therefore called a meeting in Trafalgar Square for Monday, the 8th, and a big crowd assembled. Several well-known Socialist speakers turned up, however, and completely took the crowd away from the Fair Traders who were glad to beat a hasty retreat. As there was no organization it was difficult to disperse the meeting, and a march to Hyde Park was suggested. The suggestion was acted upon, and through the wealthiest and

most fashionable streets of the West End of London marched the ragged army of the workless and disinherited. As the crowd passed by some of the clubs they were jeered at and pelted by the inmates. That was the signal for a row. Windows were smashed, wine shops were broken into, butchers', bakers', clothiers', and jewelers' shops were sacked, and their contents distributed among the crowd, which but for the strenuous efforts of the few Socialists present would have also paid the clubmen with interest for their insolence. But the smashing of windows and looting of shops was merely an incident. The crowd passed along into the Park, held a meeting there and then peaceably dispersed.

The most remarkable thing about this whole affair was that it took place in broad daylight, in the most fashionable and wealthiest district of London, and there was no interference on the part of the authorities, the police seemed completely paralyzed and not a single arrest was made. Later, four Socialist leaders—Hyndman, Burns, Champion and Williams—were proceeded against for seditious conspiracy, and after an exhaustive trial were acquitted.

The effect of the incident was enormous. For days the well-to-do inhabitants of London were in a perfect panic; the city was in a state of siege, the chief of the Metropolitan Police was dismissed from his post, and the Mansion House Fund for the Unemployed, which up to then had only amounted to a hundred pounds, suddenly sprang up in a few days to seventy thousand pounds.

Practically every winter since then the unemployed agitation has been carried on with more or less vigor, according to circumstances. It has generally died down in the summer, and during the South African War it did not amount to much even in the winter, in consequence of the stimulus given to trade by the war. Since then, however, the unemployed problem has become more acute and the agitation has reached a new phase.

For many years it was not only the bourgeoisie, but the organized working-class—animated with bourgeois ideas—who regarded the agitation and the unemployed themselves with contempt. But we—and circumstances—have changed all that. Unemployment has become chronic; it is no longer the special feature of bad times or exceptional conditions. Trade is not bad, and our exports and imports are greater than ever before, as is also our wealth per head of population and our annual production of wealth. Yet the unemployed are more numerous than ever, and they press for attention all the year round. All through 1904 the S. D. F. was busily carrying on the agitation, and appealed for an Autumn Session of Parliament to be held to pass legisla-

tion to enable great state relief works to be put in hand. In this agitation the S. D. F. had the co-operation of the trade unions to a greater extent than ever before, and although unsuccessful in inducing the Government to hold a special Session of Parliament, at the opening of the ordinary Session in February of the present year legislation dealing with the subject was promised. That promise was redeemed by the passing of the Unemployed Workmen Act, which is, as might have been expected, an utterly worthless measure, depending upon contributions from the charitable before a single individual can be set to work. All through the year, however, the agitation has been kept going. We didn't care much for the Bill, but we did for the principle involved, and we strove to get the Bill amended. At one time the Bill, poor as it was, looked like being dropped altogether, and the Labor Representation Committee organized a demonstration on July 9 in support of that measure. It was scarcely worth the trouble, for it is proving to be quite useless. On the other hand there is little doubt that it has served to stimulate the agitation, which is growing all over the Kingdom, especially in London. Here a strong Central Workers' Committee has been formed by the London Trades Council, the S. D. F. and other bodies, representing the whole organized working-class movement of the Metropolis, and having district committees in every borough in London. Through this body Mr. Balfour was induced to receive a deputation on the 6th of the present month, when the case for the unemployed was laid before him. Although he would promise nothing but the usual sympathy and charity, there is no doubt that the deputation and demonstration have done good in calling attention to the question from other quarters. The same, also, may be said of the great demonstration and meeting in Hyde Park on Monday, 20th. That undoubtedly was the biggest unemployed demonstration that has ever been held in London and the biggest meeting of any kind held on a week day. No less than twenty-five thousand people took part in the demonstration in the park, and there were tens of thousands on the route who never got to the park at all.

In the industrial districts in the North of England, trade is improving and numbers of the unemployed are being absorbed. But that will prove but a temporary relief, and there are not, nor are there likely to be this winter, less than half a million of genuine unemployed workmen in this country, of whom at least a hundred thousand are in London. We shall persist in the agitation until something is done. We are now pressing the local authorities to put all possible useful work in hand and are demanding from the Government further legislation so that the

necessary funds for the initiation of works of public utility may be supplied from a national Exchequer instead of depending upon charity. Local demonstrations and marches are taking place daily, and we are working up for another big one to be held early in the new year. When that takes place it will be augmented, it is anticipated, by a general strike for a day. Mr. Balfour intends to extricate himself from the difficulties of his position by dissolving or resigning, but whoever may be in office something will have to be done for the unemployed, and that speedily, or there will be trouble. The popular feeling on the matter has never been so strong as at the present time. I might add that a National "Right to Work" Council has been formed, with the object of co-ordinating the agitation nationally as the Central Workers Committee has done for London. It has issued a manifesto which has been widely distributed, a copy of which I enclose.

H. QUELCH.

RIGHT TO WORK MANIFESTO. APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

As all workers must work in order to live, all workers have a right to demand work.

Equity demands this, since the State places heavy responsibilities upon its citizens—which can only be met by the fruits of labour—and punishes them by imprisonment and loss of citizenship when they are unable to meet these responsibilities.

Criminals and lunatics are cared for, fed, housed, clothed, and given employment by the State; for the struggling, workless worker alone nothing practical is done.

The present Government grudgingly passed the Unemployed Workmen Act, but made it practically useless for its professed object by leaving its operations dependent upon voluntary gifts.

Machinery created by national funds must not be dependent upon charity—working people resent charity and demand justice.

Further, the insulting inquisitorial questions and regulations issued by the Local Government Board for the Distress Committees, tend still further to nullify any good in the Act by appearing to make destitution and not unemployment a necessary condition before applicants can be assisted.

Want of, and desire for, work, not destitution, should be sufficient title to claim "provided work." Experience makes it clear that unemployment is not due to exceptional but to constantly-operating causes, and the Act must be so amended as to make its provisions conform to this fact.

WORKERS UNITE!

We are seeing in Russia what united action can accomplish. Shall the enfranchised workers with their wives and little ones, in this the richest nation in the world, continue to suffer in silence?

The Right to Work National Council urges the men and women of the nation to unite in a determined effort, and, in order to give strength and form to this agitation, asks the Labor and Socialist forces to promptly:—

1. Form Right to Work Committees—in co-operation with this Council—in each district where the Unemployed Workmen Act is, or should be, in operation.

2. Call upon the unemployed everywhere to register themselves and agitate their right to useful work.

3. Co-operate with this Council in organizing a national conference of elected public representatives and of Labor and Socialist organizations, to be held on the eve of the next Parliamentary Session, in order to consider how best to enforce the following demands upon the Government—

(a) The amending of the "Unemployed Workmen Act" to give power to national and local authorities to take such action as will enable them to place useful work within the reach of all applicants.

(b) The voting of the money from the National Exchequer necessary to finance the farm colonies and other works for dealing with unemployment.

(c) The putting in hand of works of utility, in order to give employment, such as afforestation, reclamation, or improvement and cultivation of land, the building of harbors of refuge, and other similar undertakings of a national character.

(d) The issuing of reasonable regulations by the Local Government Board.

Signed on behalf of the Right to Work National Council,

EXECUTIVE:

GEO. N. BARNES, Chairman.

J. KEIR HARDIE, M. P.

GEO. LANSBURY, Treasurer.

(Miss) MARY R. MACARTHUR.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

EDWARD R. PEASE.

HARRY QUELCH.

(Mrs.) A. COBDEN-SANDERSON,

FRANK SMITH, Secretary.

10, Clifford's Inn, London, E. C.

Why Socialism is a Power in Russia.

IN 1891 I crossed the frontier of European Russia on my return from exile to Siberia. Being used to the respectful and courteous treatment accorded by Siberian officials to all "Political or State offenders," to all "Socialists"—I was rather disagreeably surprised by the rude and offensive behavior toward me on the part of the police-officers on the other side of the Ural. In Siberia the term "State offender" or "Socialist" was generally recognized as a title of spiritual nobility, as a key to the door of the best citizens of any community. A Socialist-exile was free to open a credit account for any amount of money with any Siberian merchant. Even the local police-officials, under whose immediate surveillance the exiles had to live, tried to appear on social terms with "the enemies of the Czar." Siberia was a sort of "Russian America." It never had any serfdom. The crushing power of the Czar was naturally felt less in the distant provinces of the huge empire.

After four years of exile in the most distant province of Eastern Siberia (Jakutsk district) I was confronted with a Police State in the worst sense of the term.

The sinister power of the reactionaries seemed to have had annihilated all opposition. Gloomy thoughts took possession of my mind. Alas, for the countless noble martyrs of Russian Freedom! Alas, for the young lives of the best sons and daughters of enslaved millions, sacrificed on the bloody altar of the moloch of Czardom! Alas, for the ruined careers of the high-minded champions of the most sublime ideals of humanity, the ideals of Socialism! They seemed to have sacrificed their noble lives in vain. It was a time of dark despair for me, and I left my unfortunate country with no hope for a better future for it for a long, long time to come.

Fourteen years passed—a mere moment in the life of a nation—and the Russian revolution concentrated, in one year, historical events of centuries. The apparently impregnable rock of absolutism has crumbled into dust and ashes before our very eyes. The stolid State-Church of Russia, the servile hand-maid of the government, has lost its paralyzing hold on the masses of the people. Even the army, the last and chief reliance of tyranny and oppression, is permeated with the spirit of sedition. The Russian people, who suffered slavery during centuries, suddenly

awake from their lethargy to a vivid realization of their rights and their power to demand, to command and to conquer.

How and why did it happen?

This is a question naturally asked by non-Russians, who fail to grasp the deeper significance of world movements.

Indeed, the gospel of romantic Socialism was preached to the common people, the peasants, since their emancipation from serfdom, almost half a century ago. The revolutionists tried to make the ideas and ideals developed in modern industrial countries palatable by idealizing the archaic common tenure of land (mir) as the rock, on which a new state of society could be built. The romantic Socialists claimed, that the "mir" will allow the Russian people to leap from medievalism to Socialism across the chasm of capitalism, and in this way to avoid the horrors which fall to the modern industrial proletariat. But the peasants, reared in an atmosphere of patriarchal despotism, remained politically inert and economically dormant. The "mir" was doomed to dissolution. Capitalism developed and grew. The revolutionists were crushed by the cyclopean hammer of absolutism on the anvil of inertia of the agricultural masses. Russia was always the classical land of the Overman—the social-economic and political parasite. Nietzsche's philosophical ravings were realized in Russia to the letter. Nietzsche did not know Russia's Overmen and the Russian "Overmen" hardly knew Nietzsche. But "*les beaux esprits se rencontrent!*" Judge for yourself. Here is Nietzsche's definition of life, which is a true picture of Russian conditions. "Life is essentially appropriation, injury, overthrow of foreign and weaker elements (i. e., Poles, Finns, Jews, etc.), oppression, hardness, the forcing of one's own forms upon others (Russianization of Poland, Finland, etc.), the incorporation and at least exploitation, to put it mildly, of foreign elements." The Russian Overmen "tramples under foot the despicable kind of well-being of which grocers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen and other democrats dream," just as Nietzsche prescribed.

The Russian "Overmen" agree with Nietzsche that, "There is no more venomous poison than the doctrines of equality, for it seems to be preached by justice itself, when in fact it is the end of justice."

"The essential characteristic of every good and healthy aristocracy is that it does not regard itself as the function of the community, but as its aim and higher justification, that it accepts with a good conscience the sacrifice of countless numbers of human beings who must for its sake be degraded into incomplete men, slaves, tools." *So spake Zarathustra*, as if he were trying to compete with Mr. Stead in glorifying the "White Czar" (Athusstra?) with bloody hands.

As a master of serfs, as an official of the crown, as a priest the Russian Overmen recognize no law except their animal desires, their appetites and self-indulgence. The singular passivity and servility of the peasantry offered no obstacle to the development of the wildest type of an Overman. The Czar was the Overman of all Overmen, the Overman *par excellence*. The granddukes were Overmen only second to the Czar. Then followed the various members of the bureaucracy, beginning with the highest officers of the state and ending with the obscurest of all village-policemen. All Overmen were destined by benevolent providence to consume the very substance of the deeply despised common people, the "Undermen."

The situation seemed to be hopeless for the friend of Russian Freedom. It appeared to be a vicious circle, in which the Overman and Underman, the bureaucrat and the peasant (other classes did not count at all), would revolve forever.

Fortunately, the laws of social-economies caused the transformation of the meek and lowly agrarian proletarian into a class-conscious industrial proletarian. The Underman turned into a man in overalls. This was a historical event of the utmost import to Russia. The Underman-peasant could not get Socialism into his thick skull. The man in overalls took to Socialism as a duck to water. He was eager to absorb the message of Socialism, the message of his salvation. The Overman-bureaucrat fostered capitalism with all his might, not suspecting in the least, that he was digging his own grave.

The Overman never dreamed, that the simple act of putting on overalls would change the very nature of the Underman. It was a revelation and a revolution at the same time. Capitalism prepared the soil for a Socialist Party. The heavy yoke of absolutism compelled the Russian Socialists to live and act clandestinely "under-ground." Such a life and activity dwarfed the mind of many a revolutionist to a pitiable extent and limited their organization to a number of loosely-connected circles.

This system naturally resulted in the development of petty personal conflicting ambitions, jealousies, misunderstandings and general confusion of tactics and principles. Insignificant divergencies of opinions concerning insignificant points of tactics were artificially magnified into cardinal differences of vital principles of Socialism. Great minds fritted away their subtle powers in petty personal bickerings and heresy hunting. (*Tout comme chez nous!*) But the Russian Social-Democratic literature displayed an originality of thought, a philosophic depth, a soberness and maturity of judgment, not to be met with in any other Socialist literature except the German.

The theoretical soundness of the Russian Social-Democrats proved of great advantage to them when the time for action arrived. They rapidly gained the confidence of the workingmen and lead from one victory to another by purely peaceful methods.

So today we see the proletarians, a class in all not exceeding three millions—a mere insignificant fraction of the entire population of Russia—the arbiters of the destinies of their country. Comparatively small in numbers, unorganized, economically poor, unschooled—the Russian men in overalls command the admiration of the world by their fearlessness and solidarity in the face of a crafty, unscrupulous, corrupt and cruel foe.

The proletariat have turned a political revolt into a Socialist revolution. The youngest child of the International proletarian movement finds itself in the front rank of militant Socialist parties. The Russian proletariat has no scabs. Solidarity, brotherhood are not mere words for them. They have no reserve funds to back them up in their death and life struggle, no presidents to intervene for them, no Judas-leaders. To go out on a strike means to them to actually starve with their families, to be maimed, crippled or killed by Cossacks, to be imprisoned for life, to be buried alive in the snows of Siberia for the cause of class, their people, their country. The plain men in overalls shame into political honesty and uncompromising radicalism their intellectual brothers in broadcloth, who are rather inclined to bargaining in politics as well as in economics. The proletarians make up the real backbone of the Russian revolution. The Russian revolution would collapse the moment the men in overalls withdrew, in spite of all the fine speeches of the top-heavy orators of the liberals and reformers in various congresses and assemblies. Only as long as the proletariat is ready and willing to suffer and to die for the Co-operative Commonwealth, do half-hearted liberals dare to demand political reforms from the Czar's government.

Russia is not ripe for the Co-operative Commonwealth—this is a truism. But the proletariat cannot and will not be satisfied with anything short of a Co-operative Commonwealth. History proves, that political liberty and democracy are but a snare and delusion without economic liberty and democracy. The advance guard of the proletarian revolutionists knows, that for the immediate future the middle class Overmen will reap the benefit of the men in overalls. But this is no reason why the Social-Democrats of Russia should relinquish even for a moment their logical, uncompromising attitude.

The Russian proletariat profited by the lessons of history. The Russian proletariat learned to mistrust the Overmen of all

description, even when they offer wooden-horse presents in the shape of liberal reforms. The Russian workingman cannot be sold out by the middle-class liberals, for the simple reason that they cannot deliver the goods.

The Russian proletariat teaches the proletariat of the world how to struggle and win the battle against political and economic anarchy and oppression.

Is it possible, is it probable, that the lesson of the Russian Socialist revolution will be of no avail to the proletariat of the world?

Is it possible, is it probable, that the German Socialists will keep on tolerating a Kaiser Wilhelm, an arrogant military despot with medieval proclivities—indefinitely?

Will the French Socialists allow reactionaries and plutocrats to run the republic to their heart's delight for a long time to come?

Will the English workingmen persist in ignoring the political end of the class struggle for many years more?

Will the American laborers, skilled or unskilled, remain blind to the real nature of their blind leaders of the pure and simple trade union variety?

All signs of the time point toward a social-economic upheaval all the world over.

The flames of the Russian Social revolution are already throwing sparks into Germany and Austria, the next door neighbors of the Czar. The sparks are likely to burst into a mighty conflagration enveloping all civilized countries, including the United States.

Let us, Social-Democrats, be prepared for it. Let us study the great problems of the age and preach our gospel with the zeal and inspiration of apostles and with the tolerance of thinkers and scientists.

ISADOR LADOFF.

The Situation in Hungary.

STUDENTS of political questions everywhere, while keeping their eyes on the land of the "little father" and his many troubles with the gigantic revolution on his hands, should not overlook Hungary the land of many revolutions. This, the country of Magyars, is now on the verge of a great change. The political pot is overboiling there and the ruling powers have a grave question to face.

In striving to sum up the Hungarian crisis it would be well to give the reader an idea of the country, its economic condition, and the political complexion of the people, so that the reader will have some material to aid him in judging the situation and to seek its probable outcome.

Hungary is under the dominion of the Austrian Empire. The form of government is a sort of a limited monarchy. Franz Joseph is the emperor of Austria, also the king of Hungary. The nation is composed mainly of a mixture of a Slav, Gypsy and the original Magyar stem. The people have always had a revolutionary tendency. On more than one occasion they have risen to overthrow a kingdom and to establish a republican form of government. In the year 1848, Louis Kossuth led a revolution for the entire separation of Hungary from Austrian dominion and the establishment of a republic to be patterned after the United States of America. So far, every attempt has been a failure. Kossuth and the leaders were seized and imprisoned. The first president of a Hungarian Republic was captured in Budapest and the dream of a republic faded away after one month's existence. Budapest is the capital, with a population of about 600,000. Judging the country from an economic standpoint, it is just awakening. Industry is yet in a crude state of a beginning. Agricultural pursuits lead, but as with everything else the tools are as yet very simple, old fashioned and undeveloped. Feudalism is breathing its last and modern commercialism is beginning to find its way. The larger portion of the available farm lands is owned by Barons or Counts, who lease it to small farmers, or better still and more profitable, allow the laborers to work the land on shares or for meager wages.

Budapest is the largest city, but unlike the American metropolis, it contains no large factory or department store, no loud yellow journals, and very few if any real "captains of industry."

Probably the largest employer in Budapest is Andre Thek, manufacturer of pianos and furniture, who employs 200 women and children, and about 500 men.

The country is mainly governed by a House of Deputies, who are elected by popular vote; the proletariat as usual having no voice in the matter. A strict property qualification is necessary in order to entitle a citizen to the right of a ballot.

Woman suffrage is unknown. The professional class—physicians, lawyers, teachers, college professors and ministers—is entitled to a ballot. In the narrow sense of the term, no actual laborer has a ballot in Hungary. He is, however, compelled to serve three years in the army. He is drilled and taught to shoot his fellowman, but he is not permitted to say who shall make his laws, or what they shall be. He has no right to question or to think. He simply obeys.

The last political complexion of Hungary was as follows:

Liberal Party, 200 deputies.

Independent Party, 80 deputies.

Democratic Party, 1 deputy.

Social-Democratic Party, no deputies.

At the last elections, from January 26 to February 2, the political complexion was changed and the Socialists elected 2 members of the House of Deputies. The Liberal Party is the government party and in every respect resembles the Republican party of the United States. The Independent Party is composed mainly of dissatisfied office seekers and representatives of the very small business interests. It is an exact picture of the Democratic party of the United States. The Hungarian Democratic Party is a sort of a small reform one-man element, headed by Dr. Varzsonyi Wilmos, member of the House of Deputies. I had the pleasure of lunching with this leader during my stay in Budapest and had a long political chat with the doctor. He is a lawyer by profession, and claims he is a "Socialist too." He is a good combination of the two American Willies—Bryan and Hearst. He believes firmly in government ownership, but not in collectivism. He does not pretend to be a Marxist. In the heat of our lengthy discussion he admitted that he was trying to use the socialist thunder and said that if universal suffrage were to be introduced at least 100 Socialists would be speaking on the floor of the governing body. That portion of the working class of Hungary who live in cities is well organized into trade unions, which are working harmoniously together with the great political movement of the proletariat, the Social Democratic Party of Hungary.

The success of the revolutionary movement in Russia has

stirred them, together with other radical elements of the dual Hapsburg Empire, and has given them the impetus to demand above all, universal suffrage. Demonstration after demonstration has stirred the country and a number of times within the past year, the windows of the House of Deputies met many a disaster from the stones thrown by the marching multitudes. What the outcome of the present crisis will be no one can clearly tell at this writing.¹ One thing is certain, and that is that the "hot-blooded Magyar" is up and doing. He desires universal and equal suffrage, and eventually he will attain it. The newly-elected Hungarian Parliament will have been assembled² when this article reaches the press and some wonderful battles are to be expected. The general opinion of the Hungarian press is, that if the disturbances become too threatening a remarkable program will be offered by a representative of the crown. Just one year ago, this supposed program would have been regarded as madness. It is said to include besides universal suffrage and compulsory education, a graduated income tax, a redivision of the lands of the church and state into small farms to be let out on long leases, an agricultural banking credit system, limitations on the labor of women and children, old age and health insurance, and improved housing conditions of the working class. Of course, it is also said to include increased protection for manufacturers and the usual condition, viz., that the foreign relations be left in the hands of Franz Joseph. The question, on the point of the use of language in the army is to be settled by the coming session of the House of Deputies.

The Socialists are putting up a noble fight through the usual methods of education agitation and demonstrations for universal suffrage, separation of church and state, universal and free education, and free speech and press. The opposition consists of two reactionary factions, who seem to be divided on such petty matters as the use of language in the army, etc., but the working class cannot be mislead by such chaff. The opposition consists of the following leaders:

Francis Kossuth, a supposed reformer, but without his father's eloquence. Count Kossuth is a tactful politician, always seeking compromise.

Desidarius Banffy, former prime minister, is a radical until compromise is possible. An ambitious man.

Count Albert Apponyi, although a strict conservative (his father was chancellor during the absolutism), is the leader of one faction of the opposition urging the separation of the two countries, but the retention of the king. They desire the "In-

1. December 17, 1905.

2. Parliament assemblies at Budapest, Dec 19, 1905.

dependence of Hungary" in the shape of separate commercial and diplomatic representatives only, and probably the use of the mother tongue in the army.¹

I must not forget Count Julius Andrássy (son of the late prime minister), an ambitious fellow, who, though he lacks ability as a leader, is very successful through his important family position. Truly the Hungarians are groping in the darkness. They have no lack of leaders both false and true. There are those who take advantage of the patriotic fever of the people and strive to guide it in the misleading channel of so-called "48 Kossuth patriotism." At this writing it is impossible to prophecy the outcome. A very large portion of the people are illiterate and can easily be misled. Then, again, economic conditions are such that even if the Magyar awakens to find himself in a republic he would have to turn "face about" and with new weapons and methods he would have to follow the advanced nations and fight his new enemy, the bourgeoisie, for control of the tools of wealth production. While in the past his patriotic zeal has been awakened by the cry:

"Isten áld meg a magyart,"

we now behold him marching to the tune of the "Munkas Marseille." From all appearances, if his present spirit keeps apace with the times, in the near future he is sure to surprise some of the wise political economists of the present day by carrying battles instead of mere skirmishes by a new cry which will mean victory to the proletariat:

"Világ Proletarjai egyesüljetek."

Cincinnati, Ohio.

NICHOLAS KLEIN.

1. The Hungarian army was created in 1715.

Materialism in its Relation to Socialism and Progress.

THE THESIS.

THE thesis which I am to maintain and the materialist confute is expressed in the following propositions:

1. Materialism fails utterly to furnish us a rational and intelligible explanation of the cosmos, including both the so-called physical and mental phenomena.

2. Granting the fundamental postulates of materialism for the sake of argument, they lead logically and inevitably to the most rigid determinism, eliminating choice and will from the powers of the individual.

3. Without the power of choice the individual can have no responsibility for his acts: nor can there be any reason why any individual, or any set of individuals, should attempt to change the course of events, or even to control his own acts; hence, reform, socialism, and all progress are chimerical, the individual being but an impotent gazer into the kaleidoscope of the universe, which pictures the eternal flux of matter.

METAPHYSICAL CHARACTER OF THE ARGUMENT.

The argument here set forth is metaphysical in the sense that it applies the test of rationality to the data of science; and in this sense of the term there can be no basis of philosophy other than a metaphysical one. Some controversialists affect to hold metaphysics in contempt; and the quibbles of medieval dialectics are worthy of being so held. But the reaction against dialecticism was not so much because of faulty reasoning, as that the dialecticians closed their eyes to obvious facts and accepted authority in their stead. Reasoning thus from false premises their conclusions were often erroneous. This fault of medieval and Aristotelian philosophy can not be charged to metaphysics. And I will say at the outset that I can have no controversy with one who says that two and two may be five in some other corner of the universe, or who denies the validity of logical and mathematical axioms.

GENERAL VIEW OF PHILOSOPHY.

The scope of philosophy is so broad that but a mere outline view can be taken of its field in a discussion of this character.

It includes all phenomena—both the mental and physical so-called; and its discussions appear under so many different names and forms that, for clearness, I will give in brief the various classifications from different view points.

First, we may discuss phenomena from the view point of the *esse* (essence, substance). From this view point there are three views, resulting in three corresponding systems of philosophy, namely, Materialism, Dualism, and Idealism.

Materialism holds that a something which we call matter, having certain unchangeable powers and properties, is in space and eternal in time; that all phenomena which we know are merely the activities, or functions, of this matter.

Dualism holds that there are two kinds of reality to be considered in the universe, matter and mind, so entirely different in their properties and functions, each in a different order of existence from the other, that neither can give us any account or explanation of the other.

Idealism holds that the only reality which we know or can know is the mind and its states; and for the reason that knowledge cannot extend to other orders of existence we have no right to assume them.

Second, from the view point of the nexus of matter and mind, their relations in space and time, we have Automatism, Interactionism, and Parallelism.

Automatism regards all phenomena as the spontaneous motion in matter, or matter in motion, including the ether as matter in the broadest sense of the latter term. Thus mind is a mode of motion, as sound, heat, light, and electricity, of gross matter or the all-pervading ether.

Interactionism views all phenomena of mind in its relation to matter, as the action of mind upon matter and of matter upon mind.

Parallelism views mind and matter as two separate streams of phenomena, corresponding events of mind and matter (as thought and brain movement) as synchronous, neither occurring prior to the other; and also that they are without causal nexus—that neither can have the relation of cause or effect to the other.

Third, we may look upon all phenomena from the view point of origin—the First Cause, and we have Atheism, Monotheism, Polytheism, and Pantheism. These terms are sufficiently definite and well understood as to require no explanation here.

Fourth, we may consider events, whether mental or physical, from the view point of cause alone, and we have Determinism and Libertarianism.

Determinism denies that there can be any free will, or choice, by the individual; that every act of the individual is the resultant

of a multitude of forces acting in and upon him, while mind is the impotent witness of the act.

Predestinarianism and Fatalism must be classed under the head of Determinism, though the one is based on the authority of scripture and the other on superstition, and they are thus not derived by any scientific or logical process.

Libertarianism, or Indeterminism, on the contrary, asserts that the individual will, when several lines of action are presented to it, two or more of which tempt the will, has the power of choice from among the several alternatives presented.

Fifth, we may look upon all acts of the individual from the view point of motives, and we have Hedonism (also called Utilitarianism and Egoism) and Intuitionism.

Hedonism regards every act of the individual as done from the motive of self-gratification, or happiness. Egoism, also, is the doctrine of selfishness; while Utilitarianism is the same doctrine hidden under a term of somewhat different meaning. Utilitarianism holds that every act of the individual is performed with the utility of the act only in view. But it must be observed that the utility meant is that to the individual himself, and not to others; the utilitarian theory is therefore identical with that of hedonism and egoism.

Intuitionism holds that the human mind grasps certain axioms and criteria of action immediately (both of intellectual and moral quality), and that it acts from a consideration of these criteria. Altruism, which teaches service to others in forgetfulness of self, is a corollary of intuitionism.

There are some other isms which cannot, perhaps, be brought strictly under the foregoing classification; as, for example, the phenomenalism of Huxley, who starts from the idealist's position, and, by an impossible leap, goes to the materialist's conclusion. The foregoing classification, however, while not strictly exclusive, is sufficient for our purpose—to give us the lay of the land in the philosophic world.

ULTIMATE CONSTITUTION OF MATTER.

The first failure of materialism is in the utter failure of its advocates to give us a rational theory of the constitution of matter. The theory of Dalton is so crude and irrational that it has been abandoned by all scientists, except as to its convenience as a working hypothesis, without the possibility of its having any element of truth in it. Action at a distance in accordance with different laws (those of gravitation and molecular attractions and repulsions) are insuperable difficulties which the Dalton theory of atoms cannot overcome.

The Ionisation theory of matter has been more recently propounded, and it has found favor in certain quarters. But instead of removing the difficulties of the atomic theory, it multiplies them. It takes the mystery of the substance of matter, the mystery of a wave motion in a mysterious ether with impossible or inconceivable properties, and, above all, a mysterious polarization of the ions, and puts them together for an explanation of matter. Such a theory makes too many assumptions and encounters too many difficulties to make it worthy of serious consideration.

The theory of vortex atoms worked out by Helmholtz and Sir William Thomson is an improvement, at least, upon the atomic theory of Dalton, in that it does explain in a way phenomena that no other theory yet proposed can explain. This theory assumes a vortex ring motion in a perfect fluid,—such a fluid being defined as without viscosity, incompressible, and homogeneous. Thomson demonstrated mathematically that a vortex motion once set up in such a fluid must always persist. He showed that vortex rings in such a fluid would have many of the properties required for an atomic theory,—attractions, repulsions, inertia, or mass, and elasticity. The infolding, or looping, of the ring is made to explain the different kinds of matter with their differing atomic weights. Yet this theory meets with many difficulties, which in the present state of our knowledge are unexplainable. The vortex ring theory requires a perfect fluid whose particles move over each other without friction. The transmission of light and electricity through the ether at the known velocity of light requires that the ether be of a jellylike consistency with a coefficient of rigidity of 842.8; or, as compared to steel, as one to 1,000,000,000. Again, vortex atoms require an incompressible fluid; but the phenomena of light and electricity require an ether of definite compressibility and elasticity. It thus appears that the properties required by the vortex atom theory are not such as mathematicians have shown that the ether must possess. Are we to suppose then that there are two ethers, one for vortex atoms and the other for the transmission of light, heat, and electricity? If so, these two ethers must occupy the same space at the same time, which is impossible. We must conclude from what precedes that mass (inertia of matter), gravitation, and all molecular attractions and repulsions of matter are unexplainable by any theory of the constitution of matter yet propounded.

But we will pass, for argument, the difficulties arising out of the inadequacy of our theories of the constitution of matter, and assume that they have been overcome, to point out a few

difficulties in harmonizing the fundamental materialistic conceptions.

MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTIONS CANNOT BE HARMONIZED WITH FACTS.

Materialistic philosophers have eliminated all such notions as force, life, and mind, holding that they are mere modes of motion of matter or the ether. They hold that but five fundamental concepts are required to explain all phenomena. The absolute concepts of space and time need not be considered here. The other three are matter, ether, and motion. Some physicists object to placing ether and matter in the same category, holding that matter itself is but a mode of motion of the ether, in which case there is but ether in motion as the last analysis of all phenomena. But for the purpose of our argument there can be no objection to classifying the ether and matter together as different forms of the same thing, reducing our fundamental conceptions to four; hence the dictum: "In the last analysis all phenomena are but matter in motion." And the corollary is: "All motion is to be considered in its relations to fixed points in space and time." These dicta may be said to represent fairly the materialistic foundation of philosophy. And the difference between the materialist and all other philosophers is indicated and admirably expressed by Professor William James in the alternative question: Are all phenomena motions due to *vis a tergo* (a push from behind); or may some motions be due to *vis a fronte* (a pull, or a leading on from before)? The materialist must choose the former of the two alternatives and reach a mechanical, invariant result. The latter leaves room for mind, choice, free will.

A PARADOX OF PHYSICS AND MECHANICS.

The physicist tells you that there is a fixed amount of matter and a fixed amount of motion in the universe; also that the amount of energy (which is merely matter in motion) is fixed, since energy is a function of matter and motion only. He tells you that the amount of motion of a body is expressed by the formula $M = mv$, while the energy of a body is expressed by the formula $E = \frac{1}{2} mv^2$. Let us see how these formulas harmonize. We will take first, for example, two billiard balls, which we will suppose to be of equal mass and perfectly elastic. Let one be set in motion with a velocity of two. Let it collide with the other in such a manner as to communicate one-half its motion. Then each will move with a velocity of one. The momentum before collision is two, and the energy also two. After collision the momentum is two, but the energy is one unit only. Query.

What has become of the one unit of energy which has disappeared? Some one will say it has been transformed into molecular motion of heat. Practically some energy is so transformed into heat. Again, in the case supposed there is no loss of motion by collision, and the energy which has disappeared cannot be dependent on motion, since the motion of our system has been neither increased nor diminished. Once more, let us premise a system of 1,000 molecules of gas, in which all molecules are at rest but one, which has a velocity of 1,000. Taking the mass of a molecule as unity, our system has 1,000 units of momentum and 500,000 units of energy. If the one molecule communicates its motion to the other molecules, collision continuing until all move with equal velocity, then all will move with a velocity of 1. The momentum after collision will be 1,000, but the energy will be reduced to 500. Query. What has become of the 499,500 units of energy which have disappeared? In the one case 1,000 units of motion stand for 500,000 units of energy, while in the other the same amount of motion stands for but 500 units of energy. Here, then, are 499,500 units of energy which do not represent any motion whatever; it can not be matter in motion. It must appear, without further discussion, that any system of bodies moving with varying or unequal velocities must suffer a loss of energy on distribution of motion equally to the bodies in proportion to mass; i. e., so that all bodies in the system move with equal velocities. Query. Do we have conservation of energy in the universe or conservation of motion? We cannot have both; and if there is a conservation of energy and not of motion, then motion appears and disappears which is not attended by a corresponding appearance and disappearance of energy. On the other hand, if there is a conservation of motion and not of energy, then energy appears and disappears without any corresponding appearance and disappearance of motion.

Physicists have not yet given us any explanation of this paradox, and it would appear that no explanation can be given, if we assume that energy is merely matter in motion.

MYSTERY OF POTENTIAL ENERGY, GRAVITY, ETC.

Again, a weight is raised to an elevation and brought to rest. Query. What has become of the energy which disappeared in raising the weight? The physicist says it has become potential; but this is merely a term employed to hide his ignorance as to what has become of the energy. All motion disappeared as the body came to rest at the elevation. Here again is energy which is not matter in motion. In what does the potential energy consist? It has been suggested that the ether, being comparable

to a piece of India rubber, is placed in a state of stress by two bodies moving apart in it, which stress tends to bring the bodies together. But this explanation explains too much; for the moving of bodies in any direction should produce a like stress, and the moving of the bodies toward each other should cause a compression of the ether, thus giving the bodies a tendency to repulsion instead of attraction. This is contrary to all experience, and the explanation fails. Again, LeSage proposed a flow in every direction of "ultramundane corpuscles" moving with the velocity of light. The corpuscles impinge on gross matter and cause bodies to approach each other, since each body shields every other in the line joining their centers. The relations of mass and velocity of the corpuscles have been computed to explain gravity by the law of inverse squares, also the transmission of light, heat, and electricity. If these phenomena were all requiring explanation, the theory of LeSage would be entitled to credence, combining it with that of vortex atoms. We might suppose the ether to consist of these corpuscles, each corpuscle being a simple vortex ring, while matter is composed of involuted and knotted vortex-ring atoms. By this means we have a plausible (or possible rather) explanation of gravity and transmission of radiant energy. But for chemism and other molecular and interatomic forces it is entirely powerless to afford an explanation.

MATERIALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS AND MATHEMATICAL PROBABILITIES.

But for argument let us grant the materialist his atoms, his ether, gravitation, and molecular and interatomic attractions and repulsions, impossible of explanation though they be. What next does he demand? He admits of no design in the universe—no Creator; but asserts that all grows out of the blind, fortuitous clash of his atoms. He demands atoms exactly alike. Every hydrogen atom in the universe must be just like every other hydrogen atom; every oxygen atom just like every other oxygen atom; and so on through our seventy or more elements. And all this out of blind chance! If we examine shot which are formed into globules as the molten metal falls from the tower, we find every gradation of size from the smallest to the largest, within the limits determined by the holes in the colander through which it is poured and the height of the tower. By a process of screening they are separated into different numbers approximately of the same size; but the chances are greatly against any two being exactly of the same shape, size, and weight. But of the infinite number of atoms in the universe, we must have them divided into about seventy classes, and all in each class exactly of the same size, mass, valency, and other properties such that when we know one we know all. But granting that the one chance in an infinity of possible cases has happened, the fortuitous becom-

ing of matter should leave us no gaps in the series of the elements. Hydrogen's atomic weight is 1. We should have an element whose atomic weight should differ from that of hydrogen by an infinitesimal quantity, and so on until the gap between 0 and 1 is filled with an infinite series of elements; and that between hydrogen and lithium with another infinite series of elements; that between lithium and glucinum with another infinite series of elements, and so on until we reach lead with an atomic weight of 206.4. Yet more; we should not stop there; we should have elements beyond with higher atomic weights. We can see no reason why chance should stop with lead as the element of the highest atomic weight which it can produce; but there is, on the contrary, every reason why the series should be continued right on infinitely, if we treat the matter as a problem in probabilities, as we must. Why a mere seventy elements? Why a mere thousand, a mere million, or a mere any-number-which-we-can-express? We think we have discovered in matter certain powers of combining in multiple proportions, which power we term valency, or quantivalence. We have valencies of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. But why stop there? Why is not our system of valencies continued beyond? Why not to a thousand, or a million? Many other questions quite as pertinent, to be drawn from the chemical and physical properties of matter, bring forth no answer from the materialist; they can have no answer but in the assumption of an intelligent Creator, or the assumption of one Infinite Intelligence and Power of which all other intelligences and powers are individualized fragments. If it be credulity to assume an Infinite Power and Intelligence; yet it is the one assumption which is able to rationalize all phenomena; while the materialist's position leads him into absurdities and impossibilities at every step of the way as we pass from the atom up to the highest forms of life and intelligence.

In my next article I shall consider briefly the difficulties to be encountered in passing from matter to life, and the utterly impassable gulf between matter and mind on any other than a dualistic or idealistic foundation in philosophy.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

A Hero of the Russian Revolution.

THERE took place on the 20th of October in the city of Sebastopol an extraordinary funeral attended by almost the entire population. It was the occasion of the burial of those peaceful citizens who on the night of the publication of the Imperial Manifesto of liberation to prisoners sought peaceably to carry this news of freedom to the prisoners and were shot down by the troops. In spite of the tens of thousands who had assembled the order at the grave was remarkable. The energetic objections of the municipal representatives had succeeded in keeping away the military and police.

After the dead had been given over to the earth and the speeches of the Mayor and other prominent citizens were finished Lieut. of Marines Schmidt stepped forward to the grave. His appearance aroused the greatest interest in the thick mass who had peopled the neighboring hillocks with thousands of uncovered heads. During the last few days Schmidt had become well known as a political agitator and worker for freedom. Although not a member of the City Council he had been invited by the Mayor to take part in the sessions and the advice which he had given there had brought him great popularity among the workers.

As the silence of the grave extended throughout the people this speaker, exhausted by continued tireless agitation, began to speak with a low but deeply impressive voice:

"Only prayers are thought to be fitting at the grave, but the words of love and the sacred consecration which I wish to lay upon you here have much in common with a prayer. When the joy at the rising sun of freedom filled the souls of those sleeping ones around whose grave we stand their first impulse was to hasten with all rapidity to those who lay in prison, because of their efforts for freedom and who therefore in this hour of universal rejoicing found themselves robbed of this greatest good. Taking with them the message of joy they hastened to the prisoners. They sought to set them free, and for this were murdered. They wished to share that highest good of life—freedom—and therefore were themselves robbed of life. What a hideous crime, what an immeasurable and useless sorrow! Now their souls look down upon us and dumbly question 'What will you do with this good of which we have been forever deprived? How will you

use your freedom? Can you promise us that we shall be the last sacrifice of despotism;’ and if we would give peace to these restless souls we must swear that we will do this, I swear to them” rang out his voice, “That we will never yield a hand’s breadth of the human rights that we have already conquered. I swear to this” said the speaker with upraised hand. I swear to this” rang back the many thousand voices. “We swear before them that we will devote our whole strength, our whole soul, our whole life to the attainment of freedom. I swear this.” “I swear this,” repeated the host. “We swear before them that we will devote our whole strength and our whole life absolutely to the working class! I swear this.” “I swear it,” sounded back from the assemblage amid sobs. “We swear that there shall no longer be among us Jews, nor Armenians, nor Poles, nor Tartars, but from now on only equal, free brothers, of a great free Russia,” and once more the people shouted back “I swear this.” “We swear that we will follow this thing to its end, until we have attained universal, equal suffrage for all.” “I swear to this,” came back. There no longer stood before the people simply a speaker, but a mighty tribune, whom the ten-thousand-headed mass were ready to follow. “We swear before them,” and the words fell from the lips of the speaker, as though cut from steel, “That if universal suffrage is not given to us we will proclaim once more the general strike throughout all Russia. I swear to this” concluded the speaker “I swear it” rolled like thunder over the earth.

The speaker had finished. He was kissed, embraced, a simple soldier threw himself upon his neck, forgetting all discipline, and the official rank of the speaker. Schmidt disappeared among the people. That same evening he was arrested on the order of the Commanding General, Tschuchin, and placed upon the battle ship “Tri Swatitjelja” as a prisoner. Six days later the red banner of the revolution waved above that battleship.

Translated from the Berlin “Vorwaerts” by A. M. Simons.

The Marxian Theory of Value and Surplus Value.

Continued.

WE have seen in the last article the baselessness of the chief objection to Marx's analysis by which he comes to labor as the "common something" of all the commodities which must be the cause and measure of value. The objections noted in that article, while the most important, are not, however, the only ones. There are other objections urged against this analysis by Böhm-Bawerk himself, as well as by the noted German economist, Professor Carl Diehl, not to speak of our old acquaintances L. Slonimski and Professor Masaryk. In this article an attempt will be made to exhaust the list and to pay our respects to all of them but one, which will be pointed out, and that one will not be considered here for the reason that certain other phases of the Marxian theory must be explained before the objection and the answer thereto can be properly appreciated. This task will, therefore, be left for the next article, which will be specially devoted to it. We refer here to the so-called "Great Contradiction" between the Marxian Theory of value and the theory of the Uniform Rate of Interest. Incidentally, we will have occasion to examine into the supposed contradictions between the first and third volumes of "Capital."

In discussing these objections we will have to pursue the course adopted by us of following more or less closely on the heels of Böhm-Bawerk, except where others specifically require our attention.

The first objection to be noted here is, that Marx's analysis must, of necessity, be faulty, for the reason that the field of his investigation was not broad enough; that he did not take as the subject of his analysis all "goods" which may be the subject of exchange, but only "commodities," that is, goods created by labor. It is claimed that by thus limiting his analysis from the outset to the products of labor only, he prejudged the case and forced the result of leaving labor as the only "common something," and that if the analysis were to be made on all exchange-

able "goods" the result would be different. As Böhm-Bawerk puts it:—Marx purposely puts into the sieve only those things which can get through it. And he adds:—"Marx is careful not to give us any explicit statement of the fact that, and the reason why, he began his *investigation*, by excluding therefrom a part of the goods possessing exchange-value."

It will be noticed that Böhm-Bawerk does not use the word, "analysis" but "investigation." This is one instance of the careless use of terms for which *all* Marx critics are well noted. While seemingly a mere trifle, this interchange of words is, in reality, a matter of quite some importance. An analysis is a purely logical operation used as a means to show the logical counterpart of some actual phenomenon. It serves to formulate by bringing into play our powers of abstract reasoning, a general conception of the mass of particular facts. While, therefore, analysis is a helpful means in arriving at a generalization, it is no *proof* of its correctness. On the contrary, it is the correctness of the generalization that is usually the best proof of the faultlessness of the analysis. The mastery of a subject will be shown by the ability to recognize which phenomena are most typical for the subject-matter under consideration. But this can not be found out from the analysis itself, but must be gathered from outside sources. The best proof of the typicalness of the phenomena selected for analysis is usually obtainable only after the analysis has been completed, the generalization obtained, and the stage of *proving* the generalization arrived at. The proof of the generalization, if the same be correct, will itself reveal these typical phenomena.

(Just as, to borrow an example from another province of science, in order to obtain a correct idea as to the chemical composition of water, we must not analyze as many sorts of water as possible, but on the contrary, one sort of it, the most typical, that is,—*pure unalloyed water*.) Any analysis will, therefore, be justifiable, which will serve this purpose, of arriving at a proper generalization. In making the analysis, therefore, we must not be guided by the "equitable" claims of different phenomena to be analyzed, but merely by the one consideration: the analysis of what facts will best serve the purpose for which the analysis is undertaken. Usually, it is not the analysis of the greatest number of phenomena but of the most typical phenomena that will serve the purpose best.

We have already seen in a preceding article that Marx had ample historical and logical *justification* and *warrant* to assume that the factory product was the most typical of the exchange-value-possessing commodity, and therefore, the most proper subject for his analysis. The *proof*, however, of the correctness of

his assumption is furnished by the same facts which prove the generalization which is the result of the analysis. For, as we have already stated before, Marx does not depend on this analysis, nor on any other purely logical operation, to prove his theory, but on the facts themselves. In order, however, that the facts should prove anything, *all* the facts had to be examined and *investigated*. And if Böhm-Bawerk's statement were true that Marx did not include in his *investigation* all "goods" possessing exchange-value, his theory would remain unproven,—and if the excluded "goods," upon investigation, would prove something else than those included, his theory would be absolutely refuted.

Fortunately for Marx, however, and unfortunately for Böhm-Bawerk, Marx did *thoroughly investigate* these very "goods," "which possess exchange-value although they are not the product of labor," under which cloudy description is meant the soil and other "natural" objects which are the subjects of bargain and sale. Not only is Marx's investigation of this particular branch of the subject thorough, (it occupies about 200 pages of his book), but his theoretical explanation thereof is so convincing, that none of his critics, not even Böhm-Bawerk have ever as much as attempted to refute it. We think, therefore, that we are very charitable to Böhm-Bawerk when we assume that he really did not mean to say that Marx excluded these particular "goods" from his *investigation*, but merely from his analysis; and that he simply fell a victim to the deplorable lack of precision which seems inseparable from *all* Marx-criticism.

We must add, however, that we dwelt at such length on this point not merely because we were anxious to "show up" the carelessness of terminology and lack of precision of thought, in even the greatest of Marx-critics, important as this may be, but because the subject-matter involved in this objection is of great importance in the opinion of all Marx-critics, as well as our own. It really amounts to this:—that the labor-theory of value does not take "nature" into account or consideration, "it denies the participation of nature in the production of goods. Now, this, if true, is a very serious charge. The denial of the participation of nature in the production of "goods," or anything for that matter, is so manifestly absurd, that it will vitiate any argument, analysis, or other logical operation, into which it enters. Could Marx have been guilty of anything like that? Countless expressions of Marx show that he was not ignorant of the participation of nature in the production of "goods," if proof is necessary that Marx knew of the *existence* of nature, because that is what this charge amounts to. How, then did he deny it? How *could* he deny it? Well, of course, he couldn't. And..... he didn't!

We quote Böhm-Bawerk: "That they (commodities) are just as much the product of nature as of labor—nobody says more explicitly than Marx himself when he says:—"The bodies of commodities are combinations of two elements, natural matter and labor;" or, when he cites with approval Petty's remark that:—"Labor is the father (of material wealth), and the earth is its mother." "The guileless reader is evidently puzzled. But there is really nothing to be puzzled about. Marx is simply at his old game of contradicting himself in the most stupid manner imaginable."

If Böhm-Bawerk himself were not so careless and slovenly in his expressions, he would have noticed that when Marx speaks of the "participation" or nature he always refers to the "bodies" of commodities, or "wealth;" and when he speaks of labor as the source or measure, it is always exchange-value that he has reference to. Marx does not claim that labor is the only source of *wealth*. On the other hand, he *does* deny the "participation" of nature in the creation of exchange-value. And rightfully so. Nature, including all the material substances and forces which go into the production of "goods," has always existed, and remains unchanged. So has "wealth," (meaning in this connection an aggregation of useful articles.) Not so with exchange-value. Notwithstanding the existence of "nature" from time immemorial, and the application of labor thereto from the very beginning of the human race this combination has failed to produce exchange-value, which makes a commodity out of a mere "good," until the appearance of the capitalistic system. It is evidently something connected with the capitalistic system, and not "nature" that is responsible for this result and should be called upon to "account" for it. That is why Marx went in search of the social phenomenon which distinguishes the capitalistic system from its predecessors, as was already explained at length in a preceding article. It is interesting to recall here, however, that we have encountered the same trouble over Marx's supposed neglect of "nature" when discussing the Materialistic Conception of History. An additional proof of the monism of the Marxian System, and of the opinion oft expressed here that all Marx-criticism suffers from the same vices.

In justice, however, to the Marx-critics it must be stated right here that some of Marx's own adherents, or supposed adherents, suffer from a good many of these vices. We shall have occasion hereafter to treat this subject more at length. Here we want to refer only to a historical incident, which is right in point, and at once illustrates the prevalent carelessness in the choice of expressions and Marx's quickness to "sit on them"

wherever they are found without any bias to friend or foe. In 1875 the socialists of Germany adopted a program at their national congress held at Gotha, the opening sentence of which read: "Labor is the source of all wealth and of all culture." On learning of the contents of the draft proposed by the leaders Marx wrote a letter containing some annotations. He started out by quoting the opening sentence quoted by us above, and made it the occasion for the following remarks: "Labor is not the source of all wealth. Nature is just as much the source of use-values, (and it is of these that material wealth consists), as is labor, which is itself the manifestation of a natural force, human labor power."

There are other objections to Marx's analysis. This time not to what goes into the analysis, but as to its result. In commenting on Marx's statement that aside from the use-value of their bodies, commodities have only one common property left, that of being products of labor, Böhm-Bawerk asks: "Is that really the only common property left? Have not the exchange-value-possessing "goods" still left to them, for instance, the common property of being scarce in comparison with the want for them? Or, that they are the subject of supply and demand? Or, that they are *appropriated*? Or, that they are "natural" products? and then he adds: Why, then could not the principle of value lie just as well in any one of *these* common properties, instead of that of their being the products of labor?" The last question, that of "Nature," has just been disposed of by us. The one preceding it, that of "appropriation" is a rather curious one to be broached by an anti-Marxist of the Böhm-Bawerk type, for it suggests a lot of discussion, which may prove uncomfortable to those who have "appropriated" to themselves everything, and we may yet return to this phase of the question. For the subject of our present discussion, however, the question of "appropriation" is beside the point. To begin with, being appropriated is not a *property* but a condition or relation, and that not of the "goods" themselves, but of men with reference to them, so that being "appropriated" could evidently not be a *common property* of the "goods." We will not stand, however, with Böhm-Bawerk on small matters like that, for as we have already seen, precision of expression is not part of his equipment. But whether property, condition, or relation, or anything else, "being appropriated" is no objection to Marx's analysis. The "principle" of "value" of "goods" could not "lie" in their "being appropriated," for the same reasons that it could not be due to "nature." While "goods" were not "being appropriated" for quite as long a time as they were being produced by nature, they were so for sufficiently

long a time before the appearance either of the capitalistic system or exchange-value to settle the question.

Being "scarce" or being the *subject* of supply and demand, can hardly be said to be something which all "goods" *possess* in common. But as we have already stated, we wouldn't stand with Böhm-Bawerk on such things as precision of expression and other requirements of logical reasoning. There is, however, something else about these two questions to which we desire to call the attention of the reader: These *two* questions are really *one*; being scarce in comparison with a want is the same thing as being the subject of supply and demand. Why, then, put this up as two separate questions? This would be unimportant, but because of the frequency with which, as we shall have occasion to see later, Marx-critics employ this cheap manoeuvre of "criticism." It is common practice among them to repeat the same matter in different ways, in such a manner as if they were stating separate objections, in order to make a "showing" by piling up a great *quantity* of objections.

Supply and demand is, as we have seen, not a *property* of "good" but an accident of its existence. It is not something contained in it, nor is it anything in any way connected with its production. Its qualities and properties as a "good" are not in any way affected by the conditions of its supply and demand. There is no "common something" in goods which may be called their conditions of supply and demand, for no good *contains* in itself the conditions of its supply, and its demand can not only not be contained within itself but it presupposes its absence. Logically, therefore, it could certainly not be said that being the subject of supply and demand could be the "common something" which is the source and measure of value. There is another good logical reason why supply and demand could be neither the source nor the measure of value. The proposition that value depends on supply and demand seems such a very simple one, so much a matter of "common sense," that few take the trouble to inquire into its real meaning. A careful examination of the matter will show, however, that this is logically impossible. Let us see what it is: Supply and demand work in inverse directions; when the supply increases value diminishes, and when the supply diminishes value increases; and the reverse is true of demand. Now, let us suppose a condition, (the ordinary condition for most goods) where the supply and demand are normal, that is, cover each other. What should the value then be? Evidently, nil, for the two factors working upon it in opposite directions, the supply and the demand, being equal, neutralize each other, balance each other. But as we know that "goods," or at least, some

"goods," and that the most characteristic, always have some value, there evidently must be something which causes commodities to have value when supply and demand balance each other, and have, therefore, no influence.

This question of logic is best explained and tested by the facts. Value is a relative term, and is ascertained by exchange. When we speak of the value of a commodity, we compare it with something else; in our highly developed society, we compare it with the universal commodity—money. When we make a sale or exchange we compare the values of the things exchanged by exchanging them in a certain proportion. Let us, therefore, take any two commodities, say, a chair and a table. Let us say that under any given conditions of supply and demand equal for both, say normal, they exchange at the ratio of two chairs to one table. What fixes their relative value? The conditions of supply and demand being the same for both, they ought to exchange as one to one. Again, let us increase their supply equally, say, fifty per cent. Their "value" will diminish,—in comparison with other articles whose supply was not increased,—but their *relative value to each other will still remain the same*. The same thing will happen if, instead of increasing their supply we will diminish it; or, if we will increase the demand or diminish it. In other words, no matter under what conditions of supply and demand we will place them, as long as those conditions are equal, they will still retain their relative value of two to one. Evidently there must be something *in them* which makes their relative value remain the same under *all conditions* of supply and demand to which they may be alike *subjected*. What is it?

It was to find this "common something" *contained in them*, and which evidently is the source and measure of their value *irrespective* of the *conditions* of supply and demand to which they *are subject*, that Marx took up the analysis of the commodity. It was, therefore, simply puerile to point to supply and demand as the possible "common something" "wherein may lie" their value. Again, the same commodity, under the same conditions of supply and demand will have different value at different times if the methods of its production have changed. A fact which practically fills up the history of modern production.

The reader might ask: "while it seems to be true that supply and demand can not be the source or measure of value, it is still a matter of experience,—and appears in the very examples examined here,—that the condition of supply and demand *does influence* the ratio of exchange of commodities, that is their value. How do we account for it?" This consideration seems to be what led astray many economists. In fact, the matter does seem

extremely confusing. It is evident that value *must* have some source outside of supply and demand, and yet there is no denying the influence of the latter on the ratio of exchange which fixes the relative value of commodities. This confusion is only apparent, however, and not real. It is due to a failure to distinguish between the *value* of commodities and the *prices* which they bring on a particular sale in the market.

We have already explained at length in a preceding article, that value and price are different and distinct entities. This distinction must always be kept in mind, and a failure to keep this in mind will result in no end of confusion. When this distinction is borne in mind it will at once become apparent that the seeming influence of supply and demand on value is a mere optical illusion. That what it does influence is the Price, which oscillates about the value as its normal resting place to which it constantly gravitates. That is why, when supply and demand cover each other, the price is not nil: it is then at its normal resting-place,—Value, Price and Value then coincide. That is why different articles will, under the same conditions of supply and demand, exchange in an infinite number of ratios to each other, as the same conditions of supply and demand will only result for all of them in the same relation between Price and Value, but the actual price of each will depend on its own value which may, of course, be different for each. That is, in fine, why the same commodity will, under the same conditions of supply and demand, have a different price at different times, if there has been any change in the method of its production, for its value depends on its production, and will be different if different methods of production are employed, and the equal conditions of supply and demand will only bring about the same relation between Price and Value.

Many opponents of Marx make a point of the fact that Marx's theory of value does not show the formation of prices, is no guide to the actual prices paid for commodities. But a theory of value need not show that, and, as a matter of fact, could not. It would not be a theory of value if it did. This is admitted even by one of Marx's greatest opponents, Professor Carl Diehl. He says:

—“It must be settled right at the outset that for Marx, as for any other theorist on the subject of Value, there can be no identity between Value and Price. This follows necessarily from the radical difference between the two conceptions. The price of a commodity is a concrete quantitative determination: it shows us the quantity of goods or money which must be given in return for this commodity. Value, on the other hand, is an abstraction.

When we speak of the value of commodities, we mean the regulative principle which lies at the basis of the formation of prices." This is, in effect, what Marx says in the passage already quoted by us. And the facts of experience, as we have seen, amply justify his position. It is with this, as with other appeals to the facts, some of which we have already disposed of, and others are to be gone into hereafter, for Marx-critics never tire of the assertion that the *facts always* and *completely* refute Marx.

"*Experience shows,*"—says Böhm-Bawerk,—"*That the exchange-value of goods stands in any relation to the amount of labor expended in their production only in a portion of them, and in that portion only incidentally.* . . . We shall see that the 'exceptions' are so numerous, that they hardly leave anything for the 'rule'." Then comes a long list of "experiences" and "exceptions," which we will consider one by one, so that none escape our attention. It must, however, always be borne in mind that Böhm-Bawerk is not alone in these statements, assertions, objections and exceptions. On the contrary, he is ably supported by a large host of comrades in arms, who do not tire of blowing the big horn about what the facts are supposed to show.

And first of all "nature" looms up large again. We have disposed of her logically, but she still remains there to vex us in practical "experience." Not that any exchange-value is claimed for nature as such. The bounties of nature are admitted to be as free as the air, provided there is as much of them, but, it is claimed, when natural objects are scarce, they have exchange-value, although no labor whatever was expended on them. "How about the native gold lump which falls down on the parcel of a landed proprietor as a meteor? or, the silver mine which he accidentally discovers on his land?" asks Böhm-Bawerk. "Will the owner be unmindful of nature's gift, and let the gold and silver lay there, or throw them away, or give it away as a gift again, only because nature gave them to him without his exerting himself?" "And why is it that a gallon of fine Rhine wine is valued at many times the value of some cheap grade of wine, although the work of producing them may be the same?" And Professor Knies asks: when a quarter of wheat is equivalent in exchange to a cord of wood, is there any difference between the wood produced by human labor in an artificial grove and that which grew wild in the primeval forest? And Professor Masaryk chimes in: "Why is virgin soil bought and sold?"

As will have been noted, all the examples upon which these objectors rely are drawn from the sphere of agriculture, except, of course, when they are taken from the air, like the golden meteor. Yet, they comprise two different categories of objects.

In the one category are to be placed those objects whose attainments without labor is purely accidental, and in the other those whose attainment without labor is the only way in which they are attainable, for the reason that they can not be produced by labor at all. The value of the articles of the first category does not *contradict* the general *laws* of value as they are laid down by Marx, nor does it even form an *exception* to the rule. The gold-lump accidentally found by a man will not be thrown away, no matter whether it was lost by somebody who spent labor for its production, or it fell down from the clouds, for the reason that it has just as much value as if he had obtained it by hard labor. Its value, like that of *all commodities*, is the socially necessary labor which must be spent in its *reproduction*. The clouds not being in the habit of showering gold on us, and the necessarily prevailing method of obtaining gold being by spending labor on its production, (strictly speaking,—on its extraction, as in the case of all products of the extracting industries), this gold if wasted, as suggested by Böhm-Bawerk, could not be obtained again from the clouds but would have to be produced by labor. The same is true of the silver found in the mine. Assuming, as Böhm-Bawerk seems to, that the mine was of such a character that it did not require any labor to extract the silver from it, the silver will still have the value represented by the labor socially necessary for its *reproduction*, owing to the fact that silver is usually obtained by working at its extraction. And it might as well be noted here, that, under the laws of Value as laid down before it is the least productive silver mine necessarily in operation in order to satisfy the wants of society, that will set the norm for the value of silver, taking, of course, into consideration any by-product which may be obtained from such mine while mining for silver. The case of the wine is akin to that of the silver. It must be remembered that “good” wine only has a greater value than “cheap” wine where it is wanted in society,—just like silver. There are places where “good” wine is not wanted; and places where silver is not much in demand. In such places “good” wine will not be considered of any more value than “cheap” wine; nor will silver be more valuable than some “base” metal. In societies where “noble” metals and “good” wines are wanted, these become the objects of special industries, respectively. And just as the labor expended on its extraction in the least productive silver mine sets the value on silver, because this mine must be used for reproduction, so will the labor expended on the production of good wine by cultivation of the least adapted soil necessarily employed therefore set the value on good wine, and for the same reason.

The same principle applies to the wood question. Where the "natural grown" wood of the primeval forests is insufficient to satisfy the wants of society and it has to be "raised," it is the labor expended on the "raised" wood that will set the value on all wood, and the wood of the primeval forest will have the same value as the wood artificially raised, for the reason that it can only be *reproduced* by means of raising; the cost of its *reproduction* is, therefore, the social labor necessary to be expended for "raised" wood.

It is entirely different, however, with the articles of the second category, chief and most typical among which is, land. Why should land upon which no labor was spent for its production, and upon which no labor need or can be spent for reproduction have value? With all that, however, this does not *refute* Marx's theory of value. We have already stated before that Marx went into the examination of this subject at length, and formulated a theory which none of his critics have even attempted to refute. Indeed, singularly enough, this branch of the Marxian theory has been passed by his critics with little or no comment. This theory, however, amounts to nothing less than this:—that *land* and all other objects which are not produced by labor *have no value*. This may sound strange in face of the fabulous prices that we know are sometimes paid for land. But these very fabulous prices are proof that the price paid does not represent the value of the land but something else entirely. Marx proves conclusively that rent is not the result of the value of the land, and the price of land is admittedly merely a "capitalization" of the rent. Marx calls attention to the fact, which is also mentioned by Böhm-Bawerk who, however, fails to draw therefrom the proper consequences, that the price of land is a multiple of the rent by a certain number of years, the number depending on the prevailing rate of interest. In other words, it is not the *value* of the land that the price nominally paid for it represents, but the price of the rent. The transaction which formally and nominally appears as a sale of land, is in reality merely the discount of the rent. It differs absolutely nothing in character from the purchase of an annuity, which is not an exchange of present values but a mere banking operation. This is well known to real estate operators.

The best proof, however, of the *theory* that land has no value, is the *fact* that any amount of land can always be had on the largest portion of our Mother Earth without the necessity of paying for it. The query of Professor Masaryk, supposed to be a refutation of Marx by "the facts,"—"why is virgin soil bought and sold?" is to be answered: "The *fact* is that virgin soil is not

bought and sold." It is only after the soil has been husbanded and raped and given birth to the bastard *rent* that it becomes the subject of purchase and sale, not before. And *this fact* ought to give the quietus, once and for all, to the claim that objects not produced by labor may still have value. It is true that it is pretty inconvenient for us to get to a place where land is obtainable without price because of no value, and that as far as we are concerned the argument of the places where land is free seems, therefore, *far fetched*. But, first of all, it is certainly no fault of the Marxian theory that our capitalistic class has abducted from the people all the soil, so that there is none left either in its virginity or in the possession of lawful husbandmen. And, secondly, we might ask the great host of Marx-critics to point out one place on the face of the globe, where a single article produced by labor can habitually be obtained without giving an equivalent therefor. Not on the whole face of this globe, nor even in the clouds or among the stars where Böhm-Bawerk can get gold-lumps free, can anybody find a place where chairs, coats or bicycles can be gotten free. Evidently there is a difference which the learned and astute Marx-critics failed to observe, but which is nevertheless very interesting, and ought to be for some people at least, very instructive.

There is another group of "commodities," which, although of a different character, is to be considered in this connection. This group includes all those things which, although produced by labor, are essentially the product of some higher natural gift or power, and are, therefore, irreproducible by mere labor. This includes all works of art and the like. Not being the subject of production or reproduction by labor they are, naturally, not subject to the laws of value. But some ingenious Marx-critics, the indomitable Böhm-Bawerk among them, find great cause for rejoicing in this alleged "refutation" or "exception" to the laws of value as laid down by Marx. Ever faithful to their own confused nature and very consistently confusing economics with everything alien to it under the sun, they start out from their confusion of Value and Price, and adding to it the confusion of economic price with the colloquial application of the word price to every money-payment as a consideration for something, they declare that the Marxian theory of value must be false, for here are "goods" whose "value" is evidently not determined by labor. It does one good to see how these gentlemen who usually strut about like peacocks parading their lofty "moral sense" and "idealism," and constantly berating the Marxists for their supposed gross materialism and "levelling" tendencies, come down from their high perch and place their "ideal" wares

on a level with the grossest material things. Allured by the bait of making a point against Marx, they insist that high works of art embodying noble "ideas" are just as much "goods," "wares and merchandise" to be trafficked in as anything else that comes down the pike in "due course of trade." The willingness of these gentlemen to do so does not, however, make commodities of the works of genius, any more than their hypocritical phrases change the course of human progress. While the economic conditions of capitalist society reflect on the whole range of its ideas, creating there all sorts of distorted and shapeless beings, nobody is crazy enough to seriously apply the yardstick to these matters. While an "art journal" may sometimes quote a price of a great work of art because it "fetched" that much at a sale, no "dealer" even will dare say that the Sistine Madonna is equal in value to so many steam engines, or that a certain Raphael of Rubens has risen in value since J. P. Morgan became an art Mäcenas, thus augmenting the "demand." It is true that the excesses of capitalism have tainted everything with a mercenary spirit, and has made art the subject of traffic, but this makes no more "goods" out of art-subjects than the traffic in white slaves turns love and affection into merchandise. Nor has the purchase-money paid for them any more to do with the economic categories of price and value than that paid to the harlot in compensation for her venal favors.

A different situation is presented in the case of commodities which are the result of so-called skilled or higher classes of labor. Masaryk thinks it a complete refutation of the labor theory of value that one man's labor does not produce in the same space of time as much value as that of any other man's. And Böhm-Bawerk considers it awful theoretical jugglery for Marx to say: "Skilled labor counts only as simple labor intensified, or rather, as multiplied simple labor, a given quantity of skilled labor being considered equal to a greater quantity of simple labor. Experience shows that this reduction is constantly being made. A commodity may be the product of the most skilled labor, but its value, by equating it to the product of simple unskilled labor, represents a definite quantity of the latter labor alone. The different proportions in which different sorts of labor are reduced to unskilled labor as their standard, are established by a social process that goes on behind the backs of the producers, and, consequently appears to be fixed by custom." "If," says Böhm-Bawerk, "the product of one day's labor of one man is of the same value as that of another man's five days' labor, then, no matter how people *consider* it, it forms an exception to the

alleged rule, that the exchange-value of goods depends on the amount of human labor *incorporated* in them."

These objections evidently proceed upon the theory that Marx's "alleged rule" claims that the value of commodities depends upon the amount of labor actually incorporated in them in the process of their production. It is needless to argue whether these objections would amount to anything were this the "alleged rule," for the simple reason that no such rule was ever "alleged" by Marx. We have already seen, that Marx very specifically states that *the value of a commodity does not depend on the amount of labor actually spent in its production*. And this not only with reference to skilled and unskilled labor, but even with reference to unskilled labor itself. According to the Marxian theory of value, as expounded by us above, it makes absolutely no difference whatsoever, as far as its value is concerned, how much labor, of any kind, was actually spent in its production. The reason for this is, as already explained, that value, being a social phenomenon, depends entirely on social conditions of production and distribution, and does not depend on anything relating exclusively to the individuals concerned in its production or exchange. This applies with equal force to the amount and kind of labor it cost its individual producer, as well as to the particular desires or wants of the persons immediately concerned in any of its mutations during the circulation process. This being thus, it is evidently absurd to make a point of the fact that one day's work of a skilled laborer may produce as much value as several days' work of an unskilled laborer, and consider skilled labor as an exception to the laws of value. There is no such exception, for there is no such rule except in the perverted imagination of Marx-critics, and, perhaps, some "alleged" Marxists. Were this "allegation" of the rule correct, the exceptions would be too numerous to count. We have already noted before one such important "exception," for instance, in the case of the introduction of improved methods of production before they are generally adopted, or the retention of obsolete methods of production. In either event the value of the commodities produced under the exceptional circumstances by ordinary unskilled labor will not depend on the labor actually spent in their production. Other "exceptions" will easily suggest themselves to the intelligent reader. The only trouble with all of them is that they are exceptions only to an imaginary rule, and not to the rule laid down in Marx's theory of value. It is, therefore, very sad to see how some Marxists spend their energies in making futile attempts to explain away these objections to an imaginary Marxian theory. They would spend their time with more profit to themselves and

their readers if they would leave fancy theorizing and see to it that Marx's theories are not mis-stated, the objections would then take care of themselves.

The matter in itself is very simple. *Skilled* labor, whether the skill be personal with the producer, acquired by study and training, or impersonal, due to the use of better tools, is more productive. A skilled laborer produces in a given space of time more than the unskilled one. The value of a commodity being equal to the labor which it would cost to produce it, the value of the commodity will, in accordance with the laws of value already explained by us, be the amount of *ordinary average* labor necessary for its reproduction. For it is by this labor that society will have to reproduce it, the amount of skilled labor being by its very terms limited, and can not, therefore, be had in sufficient quantities to reproduce the commodities as they are wanted. When this labor becomes so common that it can be had in any quantity for the purposes of production and reproduction of commodities, it ceases to be "skilled," and its product has no more value than that of any other average labor. The point to be remembered, however, is that while the measure of ordinary labor is the time during which it was expended, the measure of the time expended on any particular given commodity is the amount of product produced by its expenditure. In other words, the value of a commodity does not depend on the actual individual time spent in its production, but on the social time necessary for its reproduction, as was already stated at length before. When thus properly understood, the fact that the product of skilled labor is more valuable than the product of unskilled labor is no more an objection or an exception to our law of value than the fact that one man's unskilled labor produces more value than another man's unskilled labor because of a difference in the intensity of its application.

Another objection mentioned by Böhm-Bawerk, and the last to be considered by us here, is very characteristic of him and of most Marx-critics. They seem to be impregably fortified in their utter ignorance of the Marxian theories which they criticise. In their blissful ignorance they very often prate like innocent children, so that one is often at a loss as to whether they ought to be pitied or envied. Says Böhm-Bawerk, very naively:

"The well-known and universally admitted fact that even in the case of those goods whose exchange-value coincides on the whole with the labor expended in their production, this coincidence is not always preserved, forms another exception to the labor principle. Because of the oscillations of supply and demand, the exchange-value of even such commodities is often pushed above or below the level of value which corresponds to the

amount of labor incorporated in them. The latter forms only a gravitation point, not a fixed point of their exchange-value. It seems to me that the socialistic followers of the labor principle make too light of this objection. It is true that they state it, but they treat it as a small, passing irregularity whose presence does not in any way militate against the great 'law' of exchange-value."

The simplicity of soul displayed in this passage seems to be of a higher world than ours. To intrude upon it with gross earthly notions about accuracy and the like seems almost criminal. It would also be manifestly futile to attempt to explain the subtleties of Marxian thought to one who, after a careful study of the Marxian system, has failed to grasp the difference between Value and Price in that system. To speak of the individual or actual Price (for that is what Böhm-Bawerk refers to,) which, according to Marx, is *usually* different from Value, as an *exception* to Value, reveals a constitutional inability to understand the Marxian theory which ought to be admired, if not respected, for its elemental purity. And yet this is the mind which shows the way, and sets the pace, for the hosts of Marx-criticism!

L. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be continued.*)

EDITORIAL

Probable Outlook for Russia.

It is with a full realization of the dangers accompanying prophecy and with a complete disclaimer of any special gift in that direction that we take up this discussion. There are certain general forces of social evolution at work in Russia which may be expected to produce much the same result, that they have previously produced elsewhere, and so long as prophecy is confined to examining the resultants of these forces it is wholly justifiable.

A study of the different industrial classes struggling for power and the strength back of them shows that these may be classified much as follows: First the autocracy with the grand ducal clique answering quite closely to the "First Estate" of a century ago in France. This class, essentially an anachronism even in the 19th, to say nothing of the 20th century, has behind it no industrial strength and has retained its position largely by virtue of inertia. It is now almost a negligible quantity. In the second place we have the bourgeoisie, the logical heir to the autocracy, but which seems incapable of realizing upon its inheritance. It lacks coherency, initiative and most important of all a hold upon the proletariat, sufficiently strong to compel the latter to fight its battles. Finally we have the working class composed of the city proletariat and the peasant, a class distinctly revolutionary, and which seems to have awakened to a class consciousness far keener than its industrial position would seem to justify. This proletariat has shown a remarkable adaptability in choosing its weapons for the battle. It uses with apparently equal facility the street demonstration, the mass strike, terrorism and open battle. It seems to be well nigh omnipresent. In this characteristic lies its greatest strength. This is well expressed in the following extract from a dispatch to the *Chicago Inter Ocean*:

"There are not troops enough in Europe to put down the revolution," declared a trembling army officer to-day as he boarded a train with reinforcements for the Moscow garrison. "If one town is wiped off the map another throws up defenses. The peasants are fighting in their own

back yards. They are beasts in their own caves. It would take a billion men and a century of campaigning to ferret each nest of snakes out of its hole. I fear for Russia."

It is truly impossible to put down such a revolution. It is possible that it has been crushed at Moscow, but it flames up in a hundred other places. When we come to examine the forces of suppression we find that the army itself is permeated with disaffection. The main reliance of the government is the Cossack, but as is pointed out elsewhere in this number by Comrade Kautsky the Cossack fights for loot, and it will be strange if the idea does not penetrate into his thick skull before long that much richer pickings are to be found inside of palaces than amid workmen's hovels. When he does it will be a sorry day for those who for the last century have been training him to a career of blood and plunder.

Viewed from any point of view, however, the immediate future promises to be a dark and bloody one. Famine hangs threateningly over the great "black belt," and the same wires that bring this message to us tell us of record breaking shipments of wheat from this same locality. What the peasant will do when famine finally sweeps down upon him to add the last spur to the bestial degradation that centuries of oppression has forced upon him is something that staggers imagination.

The Manchurian army presents a problem which must not be overlooked. With between half a million and a million men several thousand miles from Russia, with only a single track railroad to bring them home, with a government practically without funds for transportation or rations, and with no desire to see them come back only to lend their aid to an impending revolution, and with that army itself disorganized by revolt it is easily possible that the world may see a sight beside which Napoleon's retreat from Moscow was but a peaceful summer walk for pleasure.

We are told repeatedly that Russia is not ready for socialism, and there is probably no disputing that proposition, but a few years or even months, of the terrible education which she is now undergoing may work wonders. When a whole nation is forced to study one topic and forced to do this amid bursting bomb, beneath the crack of Cossack whips and facing the muzzles of machine guns it is easily possible that graduation day may be somewhat hastened.

What will be the effect of all this on the world-wide proletarian movement? In the first place it is going to teach the workers something of the variety of weapons which are at their hands when needed. There has been something of a tendency in past years to over-estimate the ballot and parliamentarianism. Russia is causing a similar over-estimation of the general strike. Before she is done she will probably show us that contrary to the common impression the day of the bomb, the barricade and the bullet has not forever past. Yet up to the present time it must be admitted that she has advanced no evidence to show that in countries where universal suffrage prevails any other weapon would be as effective as the ballot. The general strike, amid a population already half crazed with revolutionary fervor, with no other method of expressing their indignation, is a totally different proposition from a general strike amid the confused political and economic ideas of modern capitalistic nations with their countless divisions among the working class.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

An election was recently held in Dresden for municipal officials. The voting is by classes—each industrial class electing a certain number of representatives. This, of course, makes it impossible for the socialists to gain a majority. The important point for American readers, however, is that the laborers were practically unanimous in voting the socialist ticket, and that the capitalist candidates received exactly the votes that they were entitled to i. e., those of capitalists. If American laborers did the same thing there would soon be none but laborers in official positions.

Whatever there may have been to criticise in the methods used in getting rid of the old *Vorwaerts* staff and installing the new editors it is very evident that a great improvement in the paper was the final result. There is a virility, strength and decisiveness to the new management that reminds one of the old days when *Der Alte Liebknecht* was at the head of the editorial staff.

AUSTRIA.

The agitation for Universal Suffrage goes on throughout Austria and has already led to a much closer union of the entire working class movement of the Austrian Empire. This agitation recently took on a rather suggestive and interesting phase. The typographical union of Vienna, disgusted at being compelled to put into type the most virulent attacks upon the campaign which they were carrying on for better conditions decided to call a strike upon those papers most abusive of the socialist party and universal suffrage. They announced that they would no longer set up such articles and that if the capitalists wished to make war upon the working class by means of the printing press they must set their own type and run their own press. As a result six of the most reactionary papers were compelled to suspend publication.

SWITZERLAND.

The Liberal Parties of Switzerland have initiated a movement for the nationalization of water power. The measure, as they proposed to submit to a referendum is hedged around with so many restrictions that the Socialists have taken little interest in it. It was the socialists nevertheless who originated this demand and who are responsible for even this

step. They have pointed out that the water power of Switzerland amounts to over one million horse power and that if it were really in the hands of a democratic government it might be made a powerful weapon for the betterment of working class conditions.

NORWAY.

The European socialist movement has been very much stirred by the action of the Social Democrats in the Norwegian Parliament in voting to welcome King Haakon to the throne of Norway.

The Berlin *Vorwaerts* was especially severe in its criticism and brought forth some replies. One of the socialist members of Parliament declared that it would have been unconstitutional to have voted otherwise after the referendum in favor of the King had received a majority of the popular vote. *Vorwaerts* very aptly replies to this by asking "Since when have socialists been bound by constitutions."

The action of one member is well worthy of notice. This is Representative Nissen who was not elected on the Social Democratic ticket, but who has continuously and consistently avowed himself a socialist, and who now shows himself to be much more entitled to the name than many of those elected on the socialist ticket. He has come out openly regretting that the social democrats did not vote against the King and take the consequences and declares that this was the only logical thing to do. Finally *Ny Tid*, the leading Socialist review is forced to admit that an excuse is necessary and it says, "We must remember that the Norwegian social democracy is relatively young as a party, at least too young to know thoroughly its function and duty. It should also not be forgotten that the Social Democratic fraction in the National Parliament was elected almost exclusively from districts in which the movement and its organization was a result of hastily conducted work and that it is almost wholly lacking in that necessary foundation—an economic movement.

"At the same time the condition of these districts are such that the older and better trained elements have little control over the movement and still less were in any condition to lead it. Therefore give us time. The Norwegian Social Democracy will certainly, if it is given time, reckon with its members in case they have deviated from the proper tactics."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

There is no more enthusiasm among the rank and file of organized labor about the recent Pittsburg convention of the American Federation of Labor than there is at a funeral. Practically nothing commendatory appears in the labor press, while reports of delegates to central bodies bristle with criticisms regarding the many inconsistencies that were displayed and the unfair methods practiced by those in control. At the painters' convention held in Memphis last month, some of the delegates expressed such general dissatisfaction that an effort was made to withdraw from the Federation by withholding payment of per capita tax. The jurisdictional controversies was the cause of an acrimonious discussion among the delegates. The brewers' national officials have hurled defiance at their persecutors. Their slogan is, "We stand on our bond!" and the delegates to city central bodies are instructed to fight against having the union disorganized to the last ditch. In New Orleans the brewers were unseated, and latest reports state that other unions have taken up their fight and general disruption is threatened. At the meeting of the Kentucky State Federation an attempt was made to bar the brewers, but they were finally admitted despite the machinations of the gang in control. Later on, when the ringsters attempted to transact business in a high-handed manner, protected by the police, about half of the delegates bolted, and now feeling is running high in many of the local unions and central bodies in the state. The plumbers all over the country are marshaling their forces to make a fight against being disrupted. They are an industrial organization, including the various crafts that work in the pipe line. The Pittsburg convention voted in favor of instructing the executive council to grant a dual union of steamfitters a charter, although the latter had been directed by a previous convention to join the plumbers. This means more trouble for central bodies. The longshoremen and seamen show no disposition to adjust their grievances, and the latter, at their convention in Cleveland, last month, offered no compromise. The seamen are backing up a bolting faction of longshoremen on the Pacific Coast, but whether that secession movement will spread eastward only time will tell. A report from Wheeling says that some of the stogie-makers, who were denied a charter by the A. F. of L. (although their representatives claimed as much right to recognition as the steamfitters), but were referred to the cigarmakers' union, are planning to start an agitation to join the Industrial Workers of the World. At present they are an independent organization, strongly organized in some districts, and they also have the support and sympathy of many local unions of other trades.

The elements that are dissatisfied with the A. F. of L. are naturally

looking askance at the I. W. W., which body appears to be gaining strength in New York, Chicago and smaller places, especially in the West. A national officer of the brewers told me a few weeks ago that the rank and file in many parts of the country are clamoring to cut loose from the Federation and join the Industrialists. The members claim that they are tired of being used as a football in Federation conventions, after all the sacrifices they have made for some of the organizations that turn against them whenever a test is made. Still another national officer—a Socialist, by the way—said that he had visited the little city of Schenectady, N. Y. recently, and found the machinists, metal polishers and several other trades unions in open revolt against their national organizations and going into the camp of the Industrial Workers. Some of the garment working crafts and textile workers are also affected. It begins to look as though we are to have another war similar to the struggle between the old K. of L. and the A. F. of L. But I am told by a prominent member of the I. W. W. that not all is lovely in that organization, that the original industrialists and the departmentalists are lining up to give battle, and that in some places where the DeLeonites and Anarchists had combined and held control the Socialists obtained possession of the machinery. This is said to be the present situation in Chicago and to an extent in New York. "If a convention were held next month," an Industrialist writes, "the element in control in Chicago last July wouldn't be one, two, three, and I predict that at the next convention the academic vagaries forced upon us by the DeLeon-Anarchist combine will be dropped for a plain fighting program that everybody can understand and conjure with." Rumors are in the air that the Western miners and President Sherman and his friends are souring on DeLeon and Secretary Trautmann and their followers. It is further stated that Sherman and the miners are about to establish an official organ in Chicago, in opposition to DeLeon's People, the white elephant which the obstreperous Dan tried to saddle upon the new movement as a semi-official organ via the stenographic report of Debs', DeLeon's and Hagerty's speeches. A. S. Edwards is slated as editor of the Chicago paper. Now just imagine Edwards and DeLeon editing in peace and harmony! Back five years or so ago Edwards, as one of the original Social Democratic party promoters, was one of the prominent "manifestoers," in which war of words the poor, homeless kangaroos were held up to scorn as deleonites in disguise who had no other object in life but steal the S. D. P. While Victor Berger swore blue streaks of "sepermenters" through the Wahrheit, and Margaret Haile wept sad tears and Miss Thomas said, "Ain't they horrid!" Edwards kept beating the drum on the then official organ so loudly that another convention had to be called for the purpose of searching the kangs to learn whether they had any deleonism concealed about their persons, which, I am happy to chronicle, resulted in everybody shaking hands with everybody else at least seventeen times and pledging eternal friendship and support. And now Edwards and Dan are going to edit in the same movement, armed to the teeth with trusty pen, scissors and paste-pot. The experiment will be worth watching with interest. Meanwhile, and on the other side, the unregenerated Berger will continue to fling the harpoon at Maily, Carey, "the politician," and others who deserted the "lost cause" and joined the kang enemy and have never been forgiven. Politics makes strange bed-fellows: that's a cinch.

The eight-hour strike of the printers has been dragging along wearily for four months, with the men making steady headway and on the first of the month the struggle broke forth in all its fury from one end of the country to the other in a general walkout of about 50 per cent of the members, the remainder having succeeded in gaining their demand through negotiations or short strikes. The foolishness of craft antonomy is once

more exemplified in this sanguinary engagement. Here, on the employers' side, organized capitalism has been supporting the United Typothetae of America (the employing printers' organization), both morally and financially for months. Parry's National Association of Manufacturers, the Citizens' Alliance and similar bodies of capitalists have deliberately donated money, restricted production by holding up their printing, and brought every pressure possible to bear upon unorganized capitalists, including printing office proprietors to force them to oppose the International Typographical Union. There, on the side of the workers, the compositors stand practically alone. The other crafts of the trade have been mere on-lookers, aside from a few exceptional cases. The pressmen and feeders have been tied down by an alleged agreement that provides for the open shop, and which has another year to run. The bookbinders and rulers have a bankrupt treasury and no support to extend to those among them who evinced a desire to take a hand in the fight. In most places these union people worked upon scab jobs produced by strike-breakers, and quite naturally received the highest and most enthusiastic laudation from their bosses who were busy attempting to smash their sister organization. Yet the pressmen, feeders, binders and rulers know full well that if the eight-hour day is enforced in the composing room it will naturally be introduced in other departments. What the outcome will be is difficult to predict. Despite the almost insurmountable obstacles that confront them from the side of class-conscious, fighting capitalism,¹ and the load on their backs in the shape of the neutral or inactive crafts in their trade, the compositors seem to have the best of the situation, largely because they are skilled and intelligent men, and their union is one of the best disciplined and ablest conducted in the country. On the first of the year they entered into the general fight with over three hundred (or nearly one-half) the unions in the international jurisdiction signed up for the eight hour day, while about 25,000 newspaper printers have been working under that system for a number of years.

The next great struggle that is looming up on the industrial horizon is that of the miners. As has been mentioned in previous numbers of the REVIEW, both sides have been preparing for a contest for months. On the side of the union ceaseless efforts have been made by the officers and organizers to combine the workers in every district. President Mitchell took personal charge of the campaign, and a large degree of success has crowned the efforts of the organizers in bringing the careless and indifferent ones back into the fold. The financial resources of the union are also being attended to. On the part of the operators, if reports from various parts of the country can be given credence, great stocks of coal have been piled up to supply the consumers for several months in case of a general suspension, and at famine prices, of course. At the Shamokin convention of anthracite miners last month three distinct demands were made, viz.: recognition of the union, eight-hour day, and higher wages for the lowest paid workers in and about the mines. A committee was instructed to negotiate with the coal barons and report at a convention to be held later. The operators have announced that they will concede present conditions, and nothing more, which means that, if the men stick by their demands, a struggle will be precipitated. In the bituminous field the operators have been clamoring for a further reduction in wages—some as high as 25 per cent. The miners reply that they will accept no more reductions under any circumstances, and they demand that the 5½ per cent cut made two years ago be restored. That is, briefly, the issue in both districts. There is a possibility that the differences between the opposing forces may be compromised. If not, upward of half a million men will engage in the greatest strike that has ever occurred on this continent, and the effects would be so far-reaching that no man could predict the final outcome.

BOOK REVIEWS

SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION. *By Ernest Untermann. Library of Science for the Workers, vol. IV. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 56 Fifth Avenue. Cloth, 194 pages, 50 cents.*

Everywhere one observes the tendency of people to overestimate the value of their own possessions. Not only is this so in the matter of furniture and chickens, it is conspicuous in a man's rating of the particular kind of knowledge he himself happens to have cultivated. So far from Socialists being exempt from this habit, it crops up everywhere in our ranks. Those who are afflicted most pronouncedly are usually not satisfied with exalting their own particular kind of knowledge,—of which they have usually none too much,—but seek to still further enhance its importance, and their own, by openly sneering at every other kind. Few things are so admirable in a socialist as a close and exact knowledge of Marxian economics. No socialist is justified in considering his mental equipment even relatively complete until he has mastered the theory of surplus value and is conversant with other matters that pertain to the socialist position in political economy. But one cannot help observing in many quarters a deplorable tendency to decry and belittle every phase of socialist thought which does not deal directly with value, price or profit. The attitude of these critics, as a rule, is due to the fact that outside economics, their minds are almost entirely blank. It seems to be an integral part of their philosophy—and it is likely they have one of a kind, great as is their antipathy to the word—that what they do not know is not worth knowing. There are several socialist speakers of this type and at least one editor. Where speakers and editors behave in this way, it is but natural that a considerable body of the “rank and file” should be infected. It is from this source we get the parrot cry that socialism is an economic question and has nothing to do with biology, religion or philosophy. To those who wish to see this narrowing tendency discouraged, who wish to see in the socialist thought of this country a full and explicit recognition of the materialist conception of history, with its farreaching relations to science, history and philosophy, both ancient and modern; to such nothing has happened recently, so entirely welcome or of so great importance, as the appearance of Untermann's *Science and Revolution*.” Those who wish to see American socialist thinking develop to the same scope and calibre as that of continental Europe will do everything in their power to give this work the widest possible circulation.

The socialist movement of this country is slow to produce great writers. In books, we have produced nothing as yet that posterity will

care to read except perhaps Morgan's "Foundations" and Hilquit's "History." Apart from these two "Science and Revolution" is the first genuine socialist classic to make its appearance in this country without being translated or imported. It would be a source of much self-congratulation if this book were only a thorough native, but we cannot forget the author's German education. The book itself renders such an oversight impossible, for notwithstanding the popular style, consciously adopted, there stands revealed on every page a scholarship and a fearlessness of the theological world, that one seeks for with small success among native writers. Those who believe it is "good policy" to suppress in our literature and on our platform the real nature of historical materialism, lest we should scare those misty minded newcomers who enter our party expecting to find a more sympathetic reception for their obsolete ideas, will get little encouragement from our author.

In a party where every third person is a spiritualist or swedenborgian or theosophist or seventh day adventist or divine healer or astrologer or a believer in the great gospel or "message" that "Man is God" or "I am it" or "I am that I am," the appearance of "Science and Revolution" is a boon to make one wish that a few of the defunct gods were still alive that we might give them thanks. It would, no doubt, be wholly impracticable to make a careful study of such a work as this a condition of party membership, but it is to be hoped the time is not far distant when some such test will be applied to party orators, soap box and others, before they undertake the enlightenment of an ignorant public.

As to reviewing the contents of the book, no attempt is made here. Those who have been accustomed to look to such writers as Clodd and Draper for an explanation of the dark ages, will readily appreciate the immense superiority of Untermann's interpretation of the social phenomena of that period. While he also recognizes the important part played by church mystics and Christian theologians as leaders of reaction he penetrates below the surface, laying bare the economic causes of that reaction, a task altogether beyond their mental powers and utterly uncongenial to thinkers of their class affiliation.

Another most valuable feature is the development of the idea of a proletarian science. This idea is carefully and brilliantly worked out to its logical conclusion "Materialist Monism," the latest born child of modern positive science. This conclusion will probably meet with considerable opposition, the most vigorous of which may be expected from quarters where the principal qualification for the discussion is profound ignorance of the question.

In conclusion lest any one should mistakenly suppose that Comrade Untermann wishes to make "Materialist Monism" a party qualification, let the reader carefully ponder the following passage from the chapter entitled "a waif and its adoption," one of the most valuable chapters to be found in the entire range of socialist literature—"Of course it is not necessary that every member of the socialist parties should endorse the full conclusions of the socialist philosophy. For these conclusions reach far beyond the present and future requirements of party activity. But this cannot prevent us from making use of our right of free speech within and without the party for the mutual education of ourselves and others by means of free discussion of vitally human problems. On the contrary it is one of our greatest duties to make use of this right and guard it against reactionary attempts to stifle the free word in the interest of some "sacred hallucination."

ARTHUR MORROW LEWIS.

SOCIALISM AND SOCIETY, by J. Ramsay MacDonald.

This work, which is the second in the Socialist Library of the Independent Labor Party of England has well been designated as socialism for the little bourgeoisie. This is true from every point of view. For the author the greatest task of democracy is "can it work out a scheme." He is idealistic, declaring that "individuals formulate ideas, society gradually assimilates them and gradually the assimilation shows its effect on the social structure." His definitions are somewhat remarkable, for instance, "socialism is nothing more than a criticism of society from the point of view of mutual aid and the formation of a policy in accordance with the laws of mutual aid."

He starts out to teach socialism from the point of view of biological thought, but the biology upon which he bases his reasoning is that of Huxley's and Spencer's interpretation of Darwin, which while valuable enough in its day is now as completely outgrown in its details as the old creation theory was when they began to write. He still reflects in every way the re-action from the creation theory which sought to turn out the baby with the bath by denying the existence of catastrophies and exaggerating the uniformity of nature. De Vries, Burbank, Morgan, Loeb, and a host of others have shown that there are sudden transitions in biology as well as slow transformations.

When we come to his examination of the socialist doctrines and his attack on the class struggle we are struck with the superficiality of his entire reasoning. For instance, he attempts to do away with the doctrine of class consciousness by telling us that the enlightened bourgeoisie would also work for socialism. We presume that this statement has been made by the enemies of socialism and its weakness explained by the socialists at least a hundred times a year for the last twenty-five years, and it seems as if it was almost time that those who claimed to be socialists realized that it is not to the interest of any class, *as a class*, to commit suicide, whether enlightened or otherwise, whatever it may be to the interest of the individuals of that class to do, in so far as they are class conscious they will follow *class* and not *individual* interests. When he attempts to show that there are other oppositions in society with the implication that they are of equal importance with those between the seller of labor power and the owner of capital he becomes almost childish. He exaggerates the competition between capitalist and the higgling of the market between buyers and sellers to the dignity of equality with the great class struggle.

Again he finds "no principle of social re-construction" in class feeling. Apparently he is in utter ignorance of the sense of a solidarity and an *esprit de corps* which its position as a class and its necessity of struggling has created within the proletariat and the ideal which has arisen out of it. After this we are not surprised to hear him say that the old pure and simple trades unionism is "the purest expression" of the class struggle.

Falling back once more upon his idealism, he declares that it is necessary to "place an intellectual motive above the economic," but he neglects to tell us what is the source of this intellectual motive. Indeed his entire discussion of ethical and intellectual motive forces is very characteristic of the bourgeois writings on these subjects, in that, while it tacitly implies the discarded intuitive philosophy it nowhere states it. His definition of class consciousness is worth adding to this choice collection of definitions.

He says "the workmen who vote liberal and unionist to-day are perfectly conscious of the drawbacks of a life of wage earnings; they are also quite conscious that they belong to a separate economic and

social class—and a great many of them would like to belong to another. In short, in any natural meaning of the words they are class conscious."

Without attempting to discuss what he means by "natural" it is enough to say that socialism has furnished enough explanations of what class consciousness means to those who introduced the words to the language and who have founded a movement upon it to make such a definition inexcusable! Socialists have always pointed out that class consciousness included a recognition of the social functions of the working class and their place in social evolution.

After all this we cannot but wonder why he advocates an independent political party. His philosophy is the philosophy of Fabianism and his last chapter jars with the rest of the work.

His attempt to drag biology in by the heels with superficial comparisons and analogies, such as are to be found for instance on pages 149 and 154, are not sufficient in any way to entitle the work to be considered as an application of biology of socialist thought and doctrines.

Such a work at this time is all the more to be regretted because one of the pressing needs of socialist propaganda is a work which will show the relation of the latest thought in science to social life and this book cannot but put the readers on the wrong track.

THE LONG DAY: the Story of a New York Working Girl as Told by Herself. The Century Co., Cloth, 303 pages \$1.20 net.

Of all the stories of "experiences" in working class life we have no hesitation in according this the foremost place. It rings true throughout. Its strength is the strength of fact. Its title is aptly chosen. For the "day" of the working girl in the industries here described is indeed "long"—limited, in fact, only by human endurance. The writer finds herself in New York searching for work with but a few dollars in her pocket. As her little savings disappear she gradually slides down the line of boarding houses into less and less comfortable conditions. She finds that "work was plenty enough, it nearly always is, the question was, not how to get a job but how to live by such jobs as could be got." She ran the gamut of the occupations open to an unskilled girl in a great city. Box-making, laundry working, paper flowers, sewing, were some of these. In most of these there was simply a variation in the torture, the foulness of the surroundings, the grinding pressure of poverty. The story is a terrible, vivid flash light of the Hades of modern capitalism. It would have been better had the author contented herself with description and narration, because when she attempts to add a few pages concerning remedies, the result is flat failure. But as a vivid contribution to the literature of life the book has few equals.

INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, by Katharine Coman. The Macmillan Co., Cloth, 343 XXIV. \$1.25 net.

It is a most remarkable fact that in the country of modern industries par excellence there are no Industrial Histories. This work is the first one to be in any way worthy of the name. It must be considered therefore as a pioneer work and must not be required to come up to the standard which would be expected in a more thoroughly tilled field. The chapters dealing with the colonial period are perhaps the best in the book. There is an excellent treatment of the operation of the early "Chartered Companies" and of "The business aspects of colonization." The attempt to graft European conditions of land tenure on to a virgin continent produced some curious results. Ultimately, of course, the new conditions

worked out a new land system of their own. The chapter on the industrial aspects of the revolution supplies in compact form a much needed treatment of this subject. There is, however, a lack of recognition of the part played by western land speculation and the treatment of the tea tax is the conventional one whose fallacy should have been recognized by the author. The tea was not refused because "The colonists were determined to vindicate their right of self-taxation" in spite of the low price of tea, but because of the fact which the author states a few lines above this quotation, that the English made it possible for "The East India Co. tea to pay the colonial duty and yet retail at a lower price than that charged for the smuggled article."

The industrial consequences of the revolution were extremely significant and these are treated in a quite adequate manner. "The Industrial Consequences of the War of 1812" and "The Epoch of Expansion," summarizes the period prior to the struggle between the north and south.

On the whole the work fills a much needed place and is far superior to any ordinary school history in giving a few of the vital facts in American history. Could it be introduced into the schools in place of the ordinary text book it would mean a great advance in the study of American History. At the same time, however, there are many things lacking which belong in any adequate treatment.

The period of the industrial revolution is not discriminated with sufficient clearness or treated as adequately as its importance deserves.

The discussion of the causes of the Civil War makes little account of the struggle between the North and South for the control of the north west. This was really one of the typical points of the whole struggle. The building of the Erie Canal and the railroads from the Atlantic coast finally determined the balance of industrial control in that locality and therewith settled the fate of the South.

When we come to examine the bibliography we are surprised at some of the things that are omitted. There is no sign that the author has ever heard of the previous "Industrial History of the United States" by Alfred S. Bolles and there is no reference to "De Bow's Review," the great authority on southern conditions prior to the Civil War. There is no mention of David A. Well's "Recent Economic Changes." Although there is a discussion of Washington's work in the West, there is no reference to the Monograph on that subject by Herbert B. Adams, nor is the work by Eleanor L. Lord on "Industrial Experiences in the British Colonies" mentioned, although this subject is treated, and reference made to other much less important works. There is little use made of the valuable monographs in the censuses and few references to them in the bibliography. Although the frontier is given a rather inadequate treatment no reference is made to Turner's monograph on that subject.

MacGregor's "The Progress of America," although the main source of information prior to 1840 has apparently not been consulted, and neither Helper's "Impending Crisis" nor the reply to that work by Kettel entitled "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits" are mentioned, although they are two of the principal authorities on the economic conditions relating to slavery. These are but a very few of the deficiencies in re-search which might be noted. Nevertheless it is a somewhat ungracious task to criticise when so much has really been accomplished. Any socialist who reads the work carefully will have laid the foundation for an understanding of the forces that are making for socialism in America.

SOCIALIST SONGS, DIALOGUES AND RECITATIONS, *Compiled by Josephine R. Cole. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Paper, 55 pages, 25 cents.*

This is rather an indication of things to come than a sign of some-

thing accomplished. That there is a demand for such a work shows that class consciousness has reached the stage of having its own social life. As to the selections themselves they vary much in character. Some are decidedly commonplace, others are full of strength. It will probably help to give life to the work of many a socialist local.

The mass of pamphlets has already grown too large to admit even a notice of all of them. A few of the more important received during the last month are mentioned below.

The Public Publishing Company, of Chicago, has just issued Leo Tolstoy's *A Great Iniquity* in the form of a neat and convenient little pamphlet containing a hitherto unpublished picture of the author, bare-footed, in peasant costume. This is the article which originally appeared in the London *Times* and which is to a large extent a re-presentation of the theory of Henry George. As such the arguments are probably familiar to most of our readers. Tolstoy would add to the single tax the idea of religion with his peculiar interpretation of that word. The few instances in which he refers to socialism in the article only serve to expose his complete ignorance of the movement which is now overturning his own country. As an important historical document the pamphlet deserves a place. As an effective force in modern social evolution it is insignificant and this notwithstanding the genius of its writer.

Prof. John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin, has written a series of monographs, which have appeared in different economic journals on labor questions, which are of very great value. Among these are discussions of the Long Shoremen's Union, the teamsters' and stock yards' strikes of Chicago. These monographs are essential to any thorough study of the trades unions movement in the United States at the present time.

The National Child Labor Committee, 125 East Twenty-second St. New York City, has recently issued leaflets by Jane Addams, Felix Adler and Myron E. Adams, treating different sides of the child labor question. These leaflets contain valuable material, although presented from the reformers' standpoint with little grasp of the revolutionary forces which really accomplish the avowed aims of the committee.

Comrade E. J. Foote has assembled "*Essays on Socialism*," which appeared previously in socialist periodicals and which form a very good presentation of the conventional socialist arguments.

W. A. Orme, evidently a small capitalist of Atlanta, Ga., issues a pamphlet "*Trusts*," which is a typical wail of woe from the small business man, and is indicative of the attitude of that class to whom, to quote the pamphlet aforesaid, "William Randolph Hearst has appeared like a meteor from Heaven to give light as well as to shield and protect suffering humanity." Further comment is unnecessary.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

RECORD-BREAKING ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW SOCIALIST BOOKS.

Never in the history of our co-operative publishing house have so many new books of the highest value to socialists been published in any entire year as are now announced for immediate issue. Starting in 1899 with the scantiest resources, we have gradually built up the largest socialist book publishing house in the English-speaking world, because we have, nearly twelve hundred of us, put our slender assets together and used them to bring out the books we want to read and to circulate. Of the books here announced, those by Osborne Ward and "The Changing Order" by Dr. Triggs are now ready, while the others will be issued at intervals of a week or two, the entire number being ready within a few weeks.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This is a new series of books for socialists, entirely distinct from the Social Science library which we import from England. These books will be handsomely bound in uniform style and will be printed on antique finish paper of extra quality and good weight. The size of page will be 7¾ by 5 inches, and the average number of pages about three hundred. These books will compare favorably in every way with books sold by capitalist publishing houses at \$1.50 a volume, but our retail price will be a dollar a volume, and our price to those subscribing for stock will be sixty cents postpaid or fifty cents if sent at purchaser's expense.

1. *The Changing Order*. A Study of Democracy. By Oscar Lowell Triggs, Ph. D.

The author of this book was until lately a professor in the University of Chicago, but he injudiciously taught more truth than was consistent with the material interests of Standard Oil, and he is no longer a professor in the University of Chicago. "The Changing Order" is a study of the inevitable rise of an industrial democracy, which must soon dethrone the trust magnate and rule in his stead. This rising democracy is in a sense economic, for its base is economic. But it is also true that the spirit of this democracy will bring radical changes in art, literature, education, work, play, philosophy and religion. These impending changes are the

subject of Dr. Triggs' work, and he has brought to it a ripe scholarship and an artistic literary style that make the book at once indispensable and charming.

2. *Better-World Philosophy*. By J. Howard Moore, professor of Biology in the Crane Training High School, Chicago.

This work is a study of human relations, starting neither from theology nor from sentimentalism, but from the scientific basis of evolution. Starting here, and keeping always on verifiable ground, the author develops logically an explanation of altruism and the ethical impulses which is helpful and satisfying. Especially interesting to socialists is the author's chapter entitled "Egoism and Altruism, in which he shows that the altruistic sentiment is a direct outgrowth of the class struggle. The first edition of this book appeared in 1899, and it received enthusiastic endorsements from Henry D. Lloyd, Robert G. Ingersoll, George D. Herron, Lester F. Ward, and John P. Altgeld.

3. *The Universal Kinship*. By J. Howard Moore, Author of "Better-World Philosophy."

This new work is being brought out simultaneously by our co-operative publishing house in Chicago and the London house of George Bell and Sons. The scope of the book is best explained by a few sentences from the author's preface: "The Universal Kinship means the kinship of all the inhabitants of the planet Earth. Whether they came into existence among the waters or among desert sands, in a hole in the earth, in the hollow of a tree, or in a palace; whether they build nests or empires; whether they swim, fly, crawl or ambulate; and whether they realize it or not, they are all related, physically, mentally, morally—this is the thesis of this book."

4. *Principles of Scientific Socialism*. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.

This is one of the most satisfactory statements in popular language of the principles commonly accepted by the international socialists of all countries. It has had a large sale in pamphlet form. Our publishing house has lately purchased the plates and copyright from the author, and will soon issue this standard work in the attractive form of the International Library of Social Science.

5. *Some of the Philosophical Essays On Socialism And Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique of Reason and the World at Large*. By Joseph Dietzgen. Translated by M. Beer and Th. Rothstein. With a biographical sketch and some introductory remarks by Eugene Dietzgen. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Edited by Eugene Dietzgen.

Joseph Dietzgen stood next to Marx and Engels in the first shaping and development of the principles of scientific socialism. His name is as yet comparatively new to American readers, since until now his writings have not been published in the English language, but Ernest Untermann's recent work, "Science and Revolution," gives some idea of Dietzgen's service in the development of consistent proletarian philosophy, and this first opportunity to obtain his works in English will, no doubt, be eagerly welcomed. The present volume of contributions by Dietzgen to the Volkstaat on Scientific Socialism, the Religion of Social Democracy, Ethics of Social Democracy, Social Democratic Philosophy, etc. It will be followed

in a few months by another volume containing with other matter "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy" and "The Nature of Human Brain-work."

THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

Eleven of these volumes have already been published, including some of the most important works of European and American socialists. The books are of a convenient size either for the pocket or for the library shelf; they are tastefully and substantially bound, and retail for fifty cents each, the price to stockholders being thirty cents postpaid or twenty-five cents if sent at purchaser's expense. These new volumes are now nearly ready for the press:

12. *The Positive School Of Criminology.* Three Lectures given at the University of Naples, Italy, by Enrico Ferri. Translated by Ernest Untermann.

There is no other living socialist writer who combines scientific thought and interesting style to so high a degree as Enrico Ferri, of Italy. Recognized by the defenders of capitalism as the ablest living criminologist, he has forced the socialist explanation of crime upon the universities of capitalism. The present volume gives a historical sketch of the development of the science of criminology, and an excellent statement of the positive conclusions thus far reached by the advanced school of which Ferri is the ablest living representative.

13. *The World's Revolutions.* An Historical Study. By Ernest Untermann.

Seldom does a work combine propaganda and educational matter so effectively as this. Starting with the geological and biological basis of life, the author traces the great revolutions of history in a strikingly interesting manner. Here are some of the chapter titles: The Individual and the Universe, Primitive Human Revolutions, The Roman Empire and the Proletariat, The Christian Proletariat and Its Mission, Feudal Ecclesiasticism and Its Disintegration, The American Revolution and Its Reflex in France, Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe, The Proletarian Movement.

14. *Social And Philosophical Studies.* By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr.

This brilliant and versatile writer, one of the most prominent socialists of Europe, is already well known to American readers through his story "The Sale of an Appetite" and his articles published from time to time in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*. He lately published in Paris a remarkably original and suggestive study of the causes of the persistence of theological beliefs among the propertied classes and the almost complete disappearance of these beliefs among wage-workers. The forthcoming volume will contain this study, now offered for the first time in English, together with the author's inquiries into the Idea of Justice and the Idea of Good," also new to English readers, beside some articles reprinted from the *REVIEW*.

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

This new series, in which *The Evolution of Man*, *Germs of Mind in Plants*, *The End of the World* and *Science and Revolution* have thus far been published, is uniform in size and price with the *Standard Socialist*

Series but bound in cloth of a different color. The books in this series, with the exception of *Science and Revolution*, do not deal directly with social questions nor the socialist movement. They do, however, convey information which is essential to any full understanding of the principles of socialism, and they convey that information in a style that is attractive and readily understood. This series has met with an instant success. The *Evolution of Man* is already in its sixth thousand, and the other books are selling rapidly. In addition to the four volumes published and the three volumes announced, there are no less than ten more volumes available for translation, which we can issue as soon as the necessary capital is subscribed. The following books will be ready early in 1906:

5. *The Triumph Of Life*. By William Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons.

A companion volume to "The Evolution of Man," and even more interesting in its subject matter. It traces the origin of life on this earth, then shows how it has penetrated to the depths of the ocean, climbed to the mountain heights, entered into the most minute spaces and filled every corner of the earth with its manifestations, until it has finally triumphed over all obstacles. Moreover it shows how all these diverse conditions have modified life into its present manifold forms. "The Triumph of Life" is thus one of the most complete and one of the most entrancing studies of life in its multiple relations that has ever been written.

6. *Life And Death*. By Dr. E. Teichman, translated by A. M. Simons.

How did life first arise? What are its distinguishing characteristics? How is it maintained? How does it increase? What is death? This book gives the latest answers of science to these old yet ever-new questions. It is popular in style, scientifically accurate, and intensely interesting.

7. *The Making Of The World*. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann.

This volume is a sequel to "The End of the World," the popular volume by the same author which we published in November. This later work shows how the birth of a new world follows the wreck of one that has been destroyed, and traces the processes through which the world on which we live has passed to reach its present state.

BOOKS BY C. OSBORNE WARD.

One of the most gifted and tireless scholars America ever produced was the late C. Osborne Ward, for many years translator and librarian of the United States Department of Labor. His chosen field was the history of the labor movement in the earliest times of which written records have been preserved. In the search for his material he ransacked the greatest libraries of the world, and then traveled on foot through the countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, deciphering inscriptions and investigating every vestige of evidence bearing on working-class life in early days.

Mr. Ward's books were originally issued from the office of the *National Watchman*, a paper no longer published, and have never been generally advertised nor to any extent brought to the attention of the socialists, who are just the ones who know how to make use of the wealth of information the author collected. Our co-operative publishing house has now purchased from his heirs all the remaining copies of his books, and has obtained the exclusive right to print new editions from the plates.

A considerable sum of money will soon be required to make the payments called for by this contract, and we urge every socialist who reads this announcement to send for one or more of the books. We have a supply of all the titles on hand, and each order will be filled promptly.

The Ancient Lowly. A History of the Ancient Working People from the Earliest Known Period of the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. Volume I, illustrated, 573 pages, \$2.00.

This volume treats of the traits and peculiarities of races; the Indo-Europeans and their competitive system; the true history of labor found only in inscriptions and multilined annals; the Eleusian Mysteries; ancient grievances of the workers; strikes and uprisings among the laborers of classic Greece, labor troubles among the Romans; strike of Drimakos the Chian slave; rebellion under Viriathus in Spain; rebellion under Eunus in Sicily; a bloody strike in Asia Minor under Aristonicus; second Sicilian labor war under Athenion; Spartacus the gladiator and the slave revolt at Rome; Rome's organized workingmen and workingwomen; ancient federations of labor; organized armor-makers who supplied the Roman armies; how Rome was fed; unions of play-actors and circus performers; textile and clothing trades; pagan and Christian image-makers; true golden age of organized labor; unions of Romans and Greeks compared; the Red Flag, the incalculably aged banner of labor; pre-Christian communes in Palestine; ancient plans of "blessed" government.

The Ancient Lowly. Vol. II. Latest light from original sources on the ancient labor movement. Cloth, illustrated, 716 pages, \$2.00.

Contents: Nationalization of slaves and its disastrous effect on unions at Rome; strike of the Jews under Moses against Egypt; later strikes in Egypt; Nabis, a labor leader who became tyrant of Sparta; international secret trade unions of antiquity; India's brotherhoods; class war at Rome in first century B. C.; pre-Christian unions; unions under the Roman emperors; international union of actors and musicians; the organization of the old International; light on ancient music from newly-discovered inscriptions; communism of ancient trade-unionists; their political action; girl martyrs of the working class at Athens; persecution of Christians aimed against the labor unions; new light on the early history of Christianity; massacres of Diocletian; how Constantine took control of Christianity. Each volume of *The Ancient Lowly* is complete in itself, and they are sold either together or separately.

The Equilibration Of Human Aptitudes And Powers Of Adaptation. Cloth, 333 pages, \$1.50.

Contents: Mechanism of Society, dwarfing effect on the individual of competition; Piracy of Aptitudes; Plagiarism of Genius; Concord of Faculties; Fundamental Errors, objection to socialism refuted; General Averages, how the rewards of individuals will adjust themselves under collectivism; Comparative Claims, paternalism in behalf of privileged classes contrasted with co-operation by and for the workers.

A Labor Catechism Of Political Economy. A Study for the People. Cloth, 304 pages, \$1.00.

This book is written in the form of question and answer, and discusses in ample detail a great number of the problems incident to the transition from capitalism to the co-operative commonwealth. The first edition appeared in 1877, long before the existence of an American socialist movement, and it reflects to some extent the economic conditions of the time

and place of its production, but the author was a careful student of the writings of European socialists, and most of what he has written makes excellent propaganda to-day.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

Two years ago, we were carrying a crushing load of debt. The stockholders most interested in the work of the company have contributed toward paying off this debt various sums, which have been acknowledged in this department of the REVIEW from month to month. The record to the end of 1905 is as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$4,508.28
J. B. Sigler, Texas50
Thomas Potts, Pennsylvania	1.00
H. M. Wilson, Pennsylvania	2.80
A. F. Simmonds, New York	2.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	6.30
Total	\$4,520.88

These contributions, in connection with new subscriptions to stock, have paid off the debt to outsiders, so that the publishing house starts the new year with no debt except to its own stockholders, with the exception of the current monthly bills, which will easily be paid out of the month's receipts.

One-half of the total contributions were made by Charles H. Kerr in accordance with his published offer to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders. For the remainder of the debt due him by the company, he has accepted treasury stock at par. This extinguishes the last of the debt except \$1,500 to John A. Becker, which bears interest at six per cent and should be paid off as soon as possible, \$3,500 to Alexander Kerr which bears four per cent and can be paid at the convenience of the company, and \$1,900 in sums of \$50 to \$500 to various stockholders, drawing four per cent or no interest at all, and for the most part payable on sixty days' notice. The total burden of interest is now reduced to a little less than \$300 a year, while the publishing house is now doing a business of over \$15,000 a year, with every prospect for a rapid increase from this figure in the near future.

If profit were our object, we should soon be in a position to realize it. But profit is not our object. While the stockholders retain the present management in control, the money received from the sale of books and of stock will be used to pay off the remaining debt, so as to put the publishing house on an absolutely secure foundation, and to increase the output of the best obtainable literature on socialism and science at the lowest possible prices.

Do you want to help? If so, and if already a stockholder, send a cash order in advance for the new books we are announcing, or a deposit to apply on future orders. If you have from \$50 to \$1,000 that you will not need for a few months, lend it to the company at four per cent to be returned on sixty days' notice. It is not likely that such loans will be needed after the end of 1907.

If not a stockholder, send ten dollars at once for a share of stock. If you have not the ten dollars, send a dollar a month ten months. Book list and particulars on request.

Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative),
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.